DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 960 EC 123 356

AUTHOR Schwartz, Terry Ann; And Others
TITLE The Relationship of Elementary Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Job Satisfaction and Role in Implementing P.L. 94-142 to Their Degree of Alienation: Implications for In-Service Training. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Virginia Univ., Charlottesville, Bureau of Educational Research.
PUB DATE Jul 79
NOTE 160p.; The Project was also supported by the District VII Projects Committee of Phi Delta Kappa

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; *Job Satisfaction; *Mainstreaming; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

Three hundred thirteen regular education, elementary classroom teachers participated in a study examining the relationship of their perceived role in implementing P.L. 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act) and their job satisfaction to their degree of work alienation. Questionnaires addressed four aspects: (1) sample characteristics, their involvement in mainstreaming, and their role as a result of P.L. 94-142; (2) their role in mainstreaming regarding preparation, decision making, and opinions of the mainstreamed child; (3) degree of alienation to work or to their fellow workers; and (4) their job satisfaction. Among results were that approximately one half had not been told what responsibilities they had in the mainstreaming process and had not had adequate input into the program. The strongest indicators of alienation were those that focused on schools as imperfect organizations. Grouped responses on job satisfaction indexes showed that overall satisfaction was relatively high. Other findings included that teachers with mainstreamed students were more likely than their counterparts to perceive their role in implementing P.L. 94-142 positively, as well as more likely to describe their work specific job satisfaction positively. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED182960

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ELEMENTARY CLASSROOM TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF JOB SATISFACTION AND ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING P.L. 94-142 TO THEIR DEGREE OF ALIENATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR IN-SERVICE TRAINING

JULY, 1979

This project was supported by:
The Bureau of Educational Research
at the
University of Virginia
and
The District VII Projects Committee of Phi Delta Kappa

Terry Ann Schwartz, Ph.D., Project Director
with the assistance of:
Robert Schwartz
Sandra B. Cohen
Rudy Taylor
R. Lynn Canady
Anne G. Coughlin
David Meiselman
Gregory McGee
Candice Brannick
and
Michael S. Caldwell, Director
Bureau of Educational Research
Bruce M. Gansneder, Associate Professor
Bureau of Educational Research
Donald W. Ball, Associate Professor
Bureau of Educational Research

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Terry Ann
Schwartz
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC123356

ABSTRACT

The Relationship of Elementary Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Job Satisfaction and Role in Implementing P.L. 94-142 to Their Degree of Alienation: Implications for In-Service Training

This project was supported by:

The Bureau of Educational Research
at the
University of Virginia
and
The District VII Projects Committee of Phi Delta Kappa

Terry Ann Schwartz, Ph.D.
Project Director
University of Virginia

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of perceived role of regular education classroom teachers in implementing P.L. 94-142 and their perceived job satisfaction to their degree of work(er) alienation. In addition to these main study variables, selected characteristics of the study sample, such as age and race, were used to investigate further areas which might help account for the alienation of regular education classroom teachers in implementing P.L. 94-142.

A transaction-based theoretical framework, personality and organization theory (Argyris, 1957), was used to guide the study. Through this framework one looks at both personal and organizational characteristics to define how people develop and what they develop as coping strategies for their frustration working in an organization. Here, alienation was used as the coping strategy developed by regular education classroom teachers as a result of the transaction between their role in implementing the special education mandate, P.L. 94-142, and their job satisfaction.

Literature and research reviews were conducted in the areas of alienation, role, and job satisfaction to provide support beyond that of the theoretical framework for study. As a result of such searching, methodological decisions were made to conduct a field survey of regular education classroom teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Over three hundred teachers returned useable questionnaires out of the approximately one thousand teachers who agreed to participate initially. The questionnaire which they completed consisted of four sections. The first section asked teachers to respond about such characteristics as age, sex, race, degree of formal schooling and in-service training (general and specific-to-mainstreaming), whether or not they had had a child mainstreamed into their class, and whether or not they perceived their role as having changed as a result of P.L. 94-142. The second section had teachers indicate their perceptions of their role in mainstreaming relative to preparation, decision-making input, and opinions of the mainstreamed child. Third, teachers indicated their degree of alienation to work or their fellow workers on the Alienation Scale (Adams, 1969). The last section of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate, from a set of eighteen descriptors, the factors which describe their job relative to supervision, the work itself, and people. This last section assessed their job satisfaction through an adaptation of the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendal, & Hulen, 1969).

Null hypotheses were generated, and the data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and through a multiple regression/correlation (MRC) analyses. In addition to examining the relationship among the major study variables through the hypotheses, additional analyses were used to assess the influence of selected study sample characteristics on their alienation.

A "composite" picture of a respondent to this study would show a female elementary regular education classroom teacher. She would be 26 years old, White, and would have had 5 years of teaching experience. This "composite" teacher would most recently have completed a bachelor's degree in an education-related area, but would not be working on another degree. She would have had little formal schooling or training in mainstreaming, but, if any, would have had one course (three credit hours) regarded as in-service training, which she would consider useful. For the most part, though, she would have taken the training because she wanted to have it. This teacher probably would not have had a child mainstreamed into her class as yet, and thus would not feel as if her role as a classroom teacher had changed. But, if she had to choose one service which would help her implement the mainstreaming mandate, she would rather have an aide than a resource teacher, in-service training, consultant, or psychologist.

Relative to their role in implementing P.L. 94-142, around half of the teachers indicated that: (1) they had not been told what responsibilities they had in the mainstreaming process, and (2) they had not had adequate input into the process or program. Almost all respondents indicated that money would not be better spent on gifted and talented students rather than handicapped ones, and all the money necessary to educate handicapped students should be spent. Responses elicited from teachers also showed them to have positive feelings about themselves in the mainstreaming process, and their role and capabilities in teaching a mainstreamed child as well as any of their regular education colleagues.

In terms of alienation, the strongest indicators were those which focus on schools as imperfect organizations. Teachers feel that they don't have meaningful input into decisions that are made in their schools in spite of serving on major committees, and that they cannot get policies changed in the school. Additionally, more than one-third of the respondents perceived that their colleagues feel lonely.

Relative to job satisfaction, grouped responses showed overall job satisfaction to be relatively high. Teachers described the supervision on their job most positively, then the people on their job. Most respondents indicated they felt the work itself, however, to be much less positive a part of their job satisfaction than the other factors.

Black regular education classroom teachers would be less likely to have had a child mainstreamed into their classroom than their White counterparts. Similarly, teachers whose most recent degree is the Master's and those who perceive a change in the role would be more likely to have had a child mainstreamed into their class than would their counterparts.

The major null hypothesis and all three minor null hypotheses were rejected. Over 35% of the variance in the alienation of regular education classroom teachers was accounted for by their job satisfaction and perceived role in implementing P.L. 94-142. In addition, selected study sample characteristics such as age, race, having had a child mainstreamed into their classroom, and perceiving a change in their role as a result of P.L. 94-142 added another 7% of variance to be accounted for in alienation. Several other findings also emerged:

1. the older the teacher, the more likely he/she is to perceive a change in role as a result of P.L. 94-142;

2. the older the teacher, the more positive his/her work-specific job satisfaction;

3. Black teachers indicated less people-specific job satisfaction than their White counterparts;

4. teachers who have had children mainstreamed into their classroom are more likely to perceive the role in implementing P.L. 94-142 positively than are their counterparts;

5. teachers who have had children mainstreamed into their classroom are more likely to describe their work-specific job satisfaction positively than are their counterparts; and

6. teachers who perceive their role has changed as a result of P.L. 94-142 are more likely to describe their overall job satisfaction and people-specific job satisfaction positively than are their counterparts.

Table of Contents

Abstract

One - The Problem 1

Introduction 1

Research Problems 4

Need for the Study 5

Conceptual Rationale 6

Delimitations 8

Two - Review of Related Literature and Research 9

Role 10

Job Satisfaction 18

Alienation 33

Summary 42

Three - Research Design and Methodology 44

Population and Sample 45

Instrumentation 48

Data Collection Procedures 72

Hypotheses and Treatment of Data 74

Four - Findings 76

Responses to Theory - Based Items 77

Participation in Mainstreaming as Related to Selected Characteristics of the Study Sample 91

Tests of the Hypotheses 94

Table of Contents

Five - Summary, Implications, and Conclusions........................ 108

Summary.. 108

Implications of the Study.. 112

A Look to the Future... 117

Appendices... 122

References... 141

List of Tables

Table 1: Role Scale-Opinions Toward the Mainstreamed Child........... 52

Table 2: Role Scale-In-Service Training............................ 53

Table 3: Role Scale-Competency to Teach Mainstreamed Child........... 54

Table 4: Role Scale-Providing Input into the Mainstreaming Process... 55

Table 5: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix—Role Instrument—Four Factors... 57

Table 6: Distribution of Items on Four Scales of Role Instrument for Reliability Determination.................... 58

Table 7: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix—JDI Work, Supervision, People.. 64-65

Table 8: Alienation Scale.. 67-68

Table 9: Distribution of Items and Reliabilities for Scales and Total Alienation Instrument...................... 70

Table 10: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix—Alienation Scale............. 71

Table 11: Percentages and Descriptive Statistics for Role Items..... 78-81

Table 12: Percentages and Descriptive Statistics for Alienation Items.. 83-84

Table 13: Percentages and Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction Items.. 86-88

Table 14: Means and Standard Deviations of Selected Study Variables (N=289)... 90

List of Tables

Table 15: Relationship of Selected Characteristics of Study Sample to Whether a Handicapped Child Has Been Mainstreamed into Classroom.................................. 92

Table 16: Zero Order Correlation Matrix of Selected Study Variables.. 95

Table 17: Results of the Stepwise Regression of Alienation on Job Satisfaction (Total) and Role (N=289)................ 101

Table 18: Results of the Regression of Alienation on Job Satisfaction (Total) and Role (N=289)....................... 102

Table 19: Results of the Regression of Alienation on Job Satisfaction Work, Supervision, and People and Role (N=289).. 103

Table 20: Results of the Stepwise Regression of Alienation on Job Satisfaction (Total), Role, and Selected Study Sample Characteristics (N=289)............................. 105

Table 21: Results of the Regression of Alienation on Selected Study Sample Characteristics, Role and Job Satisfaction (N=289).................................... 106

One - The Problem

Introduction

In the fall of 1975, the culmination of a federal legislative battle occurred with the passage of Public Law 94-142, one part of which requires "procedures to assure that...handicapped children [are afforded a free, appropriate public education]...with children who are not handicapped...." This notion of establishing educational services in the "least restrictive environment" forms the thrust of P.L. 94-142.

For the most part, the concept of "least restrictive environment" is used interchangeably with the notion of "mainstreaming" (Barbacovi & Clelland, 1977). Both notions relate to a change in the orientation of special education programs from alternative service to general service; and regular education programs from group-designed and delivered instruction to specially-designed, individualized education programs.

Although, strictly speaking, the states are given the burden of implementing P.L. 94-142, their responsibilities are those of setting up guidelines and monitoring procedures; the impact of providing services seems to rest with the local education agencies (LEAs) - the school systems. Dimensions of the program such as population assessment, planning, implementation, and evaluation, which constitute parts of the new service system have become the responsibility of the staffs of the schools in each system.

The need for staff development activities is recognized in P.L. 94-142, specifically, the development and improvement of both general and special education teacher competencies. Although not many people would take issue with the concepts, the reality of implementing mainstreaming seems to have caused numerous problems (Keogh & Levitt, 1976; Barbacovi & Clelland, 1977;

Cruickshank, 1977). In the furor of implementation, hastily formed programs have created potentially explosive situations. Classroom teachers are untrained or ill prepared for the change; cooperation and articulation between regular education classroom teachers and special education teachers are lacking; and role responsibilities of regular education classroom teachers, which formerly were separate from those of special education teachers, seem to have grown in magnitude, complexity, and vagueness.

This "quiet revolution" (Diamond, 1973) of the mainstreaming mandate became fully effective last September (1978). Many teachers feared that the addition of handicapped youngsters to their classrooms might be premature, stressful, and exhausting (Boyd, 1978). Administrators, too, were apprehensive about the personnel costs as well as the financial costs which apparently would have to be paid one way or another.

People in organizations develop adaptive mechanisms - coping strategies - to deal with different situations which cause them frustration (Blauner, 1964). When one views schools as organizations, and teachers as just one group of participants in such systems, the viewer must realize that "the psychological center of teaching...lies in the classroom where teachers encounter their major challenges and reap their most valued rewards" (Corwin & Edelfelt, 1977, p.20). The teaching assignment which allows the classroom teacher to reap such benefits is a rare one indeed. Thus, classroom teachers must develop coping strategies to deal with less-than-ideal situations.

How far must frustrations progress before coping strategies develop? According to Argyris (1957), one needs to look transactionally at both personal (P) and organizational (O) characteristics of workers in an organization in order to define potential strategies for coping with frustration.

In a later work, in fact, Argyris (1964) discusses alienation as one coping strategy which workers might adopt. Alienation is an activity which permits the expression of frustration without being too overt. Thus, to the extent that the conceptualization which Argyris proffers is true, classroom teacher alienation as an outcome of certain personal and organizational dimensions relative to mainstreaming can be explored.

More specifically, when teachers' needs are examined through their job satisfaction (P dimension), and their role relative to mainstreaming is examined (O dimension) concomitantly, their alienation, as one coping strategy, should be explained. It is these relationships which this study explored.

Research Problems

Is there a relationship among regular education classroom teachers' perceived role in implementing mainstreaming, their perceived job satisfaction, and their perceived alienation?

a. Is there a relationship between perceived role and perceived alienation?

b. Is there a relationship between perceived job satisfaction and perceived alienation?

c. Is there a relationship between perceived role and perceived job satisfaction?

Need For The Study

In-service education for public school teachers is currently receiving national attention. In the past, in-service programs were designed as educational supplements loosely aimed at updating teaching skills. Today, however, in-service education has assumed a new dimension largely due to the impact of P.L. 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. P.L. 94-142 (Part B) has mandated a comprehensive program of personnel development through in-service education. Overseen by each state education agency (SEA), the in-service plan is an attempt to assist both regular and special educators in adjusting to their new roles and responsibilities in the education of handicapped children.

The placement of many mildly and moderately handicapped children in regular education classrooms under the educational priority of mainstreaming has created a new phenomenon in the educational field. MacMillan and Semmel (1977) have stated that, "the question is no longer whether to mainstream but rather how most effectively to mainstream" (p.1), and this question cannot be answered without a careful consideration of the personnel directly involved in the educational effort.

The National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped (1977) estimated that 260,000 special educators and over 2 million regular educators are in need of in-service training in order to execute the mandate properly. The success of the mainstreaming effort depends upon the attitudes and abilities of these teachers and the minimizing of alienation through in-service education.

Conceptual Rationale

Argyris' Personality and Organization theory served as the theoretical framework for this study. Through these two dimensions, the adaptive activity (coping strategy) of alienation of regular education classroom teachers was examined.

Alienation is one activity which can occur among classroom teachers when their psychological needs are not fulfilled by the work situation and when it is some structural characteristic of schools which is the hindering agent. It also can occur when teachers do not look for needs to be fulfilled on the job, yet the role requirements of the job "demand" such need fulfillment. In either instance, "one could derive that employees would tend to be frustrated, in conflict," and to resort to alienation activities (Argyris, 1964, p.59).

Adapting to the requirements of an organization such as a school by evidencing alienation is an outcome, according to Argyris, of the transaction of two interdependent dimensions -- personality (P) and organization (O). The personality dimension is rooted in the concept of "need." Although closely related to Abraham Maslow's explanation of the development of needs and their fulfillment, "Argyris' development of the concepts of needs...recognizes that individuals place different degrees of importance on the same need and on different needs" (Williams, 1977, p.12). It is through the operationalization of need fulfillment as job satisfaction that the personality dimension will be used here.

The organizational dimension of the theory can be represented by the notion of structural characteristics of the school. In a bureaucratic sense, organizations require workers to perform specialized work to accomplish organizational goals. Teachers' "roles" in schools represent such structural characteristics in this study. This notion of role refers explicitly to the teacher's role in implementing mainstreaming. Such aspects of "role" as decision-making input; integration; degree of competency; and opinion of the client are all included as role responsibilities. Here, again, it is the notion of role fulfillment which is central to the organization.

The P and O theory posits that the "dynamic interactions" (Argyris, 1957, p.13) of the organizational and the personality variables can yield unintended outcomes of adaptive coping strategies such as alienation. Thus, where regular classroom teachers perceive their role to be one of frustration or one leading to conflict or vagueness so that their job satisfaction is not as high as it could be, they might evidence a coping strategy such as alienation.

Delimitations

1. This study is delimited in subjects to elementary classroom teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia who agreed to cooperate. Any generalizations made relative to the findings, therefore, should be limited to the population from which these subjects came.

2. Other coping strategies or adaptive activities by teachers might have been investigated, such as absenteeism rates and turnover rates. This study was limited to the examination of alienation as a coping strategy.

Two - The Review of Related Literature and Research

A summary of literature and research studies which are relevant to the variables in the study is included in this section. Investigations into notions of teachers' role in implementing P.L. 94-142, job satisfaction, and alienation will be presented respectively. It should be noted that studies which are relevant to the operationalization of any of these variables are introduced in the third section of the report under Instrumentation.

The purposes of this section are twofold: (1) to review the literature and research which provided the support for this study and its conceptual rationale; and (2) to discuss implications of the literature and research in order to provide the reader further insight into the notions of role, job satisfaction, and alienation. Through these two objectives, a firm basis will be established for generating and testing hypotheses.

Role

In a 1926 article, Park comments that:

> ...everyone is always and everywhere, more or less consciously, playing a role... It is in these roles that we know each other; it is in these roles that we know ourselves.... In the end, our conception of our role becomes second nature and an integral part of our personality. (p.137)

The notion of role is a fairly well-established concept in the social sciences literature. Linton's classic anthropological work, The Study of Man (1936), is a traditional source of the concept.

Noting that the function of societies depends on patterns of reciprocal behavior for individuals, Linton differentiates between status and role. "A status, as distinct from the individual who may occupy it, is simply a collection of rights and duties" (p.113). On the other hand, "a role represents the dynamic aspects of a status" (p.114). A status is occupied in relation to other status positions in a hierarchy; when the rights or duties of the status are put into effect, the individual is performing a role. Because role and status are inseparable, Linton observes, it is of only academic interest to distinguish between them.

The combination of role and status derived from social patterns represents "the minimum of attitudes and behavior which [the individual] must assume if he is to participate in the overt expression of the pattern." Thus, status and role become "models for organizing the attitudes and behavior of the individual so that these willbe congruous with those of the other individuals participating in the expression of the pattern" (p.114).

Basing his text, The Social System, on what he terms an action frame of reference, Parsons (1951) similarly explores the interrelations among personality, culture, and the social system to which the notion of role behavior is central. He observes that the structure of a social system is a network of relations among interacting actors; the patterned relationship of each participant is the most significant unit of the social system. Participation has two aspects: status, or the actor's place in the structure, and role, "what the actor does in his relations with others seen in the context of its functional significance for the social system" (p.25).

At each point in the development of his conceptual framework, Parsons emphasizes the interdependence of culture, personality, and social system within an overarching theory of action. The impact of his scheme of reciprocal integration of the three subtheories has considerably affected the writing of others.

The influence of Parsons is evident in attempts made by Getzels and others to develop a model with which to explain the individual's role in a social system. The analysis of the system is treated as both sociological and psychological:

> We initially conceive of the social system as involving two classes of phenomena which are at once conceptually independent and phenomenally interactive. First, there are the institutions with certain roles and expectations that will fulfill the goals of the system [the nomothetic dimension]. Secondly, there are the individuals with certain personalities and need-dispositions [the idiographic dimension] inhabiting the system, whose observed interactions comprise what we call social or group behavior.(Getzels & Thelen, 1960, p.65)

Within the system, the role is the most important analytic unit. A role is defined in terms of expectations or privileges, powers, and responsibilities; a role derives its meaning from other related roles. Because roles are inhabited by individuals, it is not sufficient to examine simply the institutional demands of the role; the individual's needs and personality are also important determinants. The behavior of an individual in a social system is "an inextricable combination of role and personality relations" (Getzels, Lipham, & Campbell, 1968, p.105) although the proportion of role and personality factors determining behavior will vary according to role, individual, and social system.

Katz and Kahn (1978) synthesize the major theoretical works on role. They describe "role" as one component of major social systems, a component which defines specific forms of behavior associated with given positions. Roles develop originally from task requirements:

> In their pure or organizational form, roles are standardized patterns of behavior required of all persons playing a part in a given functional relationship, regardless of personal wishes or interpersonal obligations irrelevant to the functional relationship.(p.43)

Role requirements are stated in quite specific terms, and the individual who assumes a role is expected to perform according to the institutionalized standards for that role. The individual in an organization is not at liberty to transform his role so that it matches his personality. "Roles are found in their purest form when they are completely divorced from the personalities of role incumbents and from any emotional tie that could encumber the role relationship" (Katz & Kahn, p.45).

Katz and Kahn view individual role behavior as interrelated with the activities of others in the system resulting in an interdependent network or social system. Association with supervisors, subordinates, or work peers constitute the individual's role set. Members of the role set develop expectations about what the individual should do in the role; the individual's own conception of what he is to do and how he is to behave is influenced by those expectations. The interplay of role sending and role receiving behavior in a context of on-going and interconnected role episodes centers on the focal person.

This process is shaped by personal, interpersonal, and systemic factors, such as the previous experience of the focal person, the sanctioning power of role senders, and the levels of hierarchy in the organization. Furthermore, it has been observed that while organizations select the individual they think will assume a certain role successfully, the role itself affects the perceptions and attitude of the individual role taker.

Role behavior is rarely so simple that a role episode is confined to a single activity or to one subsystem of the larger organization. An individual may find himself holding two separate roles or multiple roles which are subroles of one position. As Katz and Kahn (1978) note, "The essential dilemma is that there is no escape from the coordinative needs resulting from specialized subsystems and fractionated jobs" (p.199). In fact, when such coordinative needs are not met, the individual's position is an ambiguous one.

Role ambiguity or uncertainty about what an individual is supposed to do, who comprises the role set, or how role behavior is to be evaluated is also a source of complexity. Katz and Kahn (1978) report that, like role conflict, role ambiguity results in lowered job satisfaction, increased stress and tension, lower self confidence, and diminished effectiveness of performance. However, "maximum specificity" is not "maximally desirable" either (p.205); individuals prefer having a range of acceptable behavior within which to operate.

The emerging role of the regular education classroom teacher facing the prospect of teaching a child who has traditionally been segregated in special education classes has not been widely explored. There has not been any literary piece which has dealt specifically and/or in-depth with the topic of the teacher's perception of his role in the process of mainstreaming. This section of the literature search includes three areas of inquiry: teacher preparation in mainstreaming; in-service programs in mainstreaming; and resource personnel for the mainstreaming process.

Arguments have been made in a number of studies that the mainstreaming process has been initiated before schools, teachers, and students have been properly prepared. Kavanagh (1977) suggests that one reason this was done was that special education teachers had little to lose by being relieved of a primary responsibility. Case historians have documented that much time has been lost as a result ("The School Year Has Been a Total Disaster," 1977).

The rights of both teachers and normal students may have been violated. Perhaps more attention should have been given to preparing teachers for the feeling that may arise in them in response to a child's disability ("The Teacher and Mainstreaming," 1978; Valletutti, 1969) as a disabled child may well affect the teacher's emotional and psychological well-being. This may cause, in turn, unpredictable reactions. Martin (1974) notes that it may also be necessary to prepare the normal children for the reception of a mainstreamed child. A mainstreamed child will often create many logistical problems; non-handicapped children should be helped to understand their problems and requirements. Attempts must be made to keep interaction positive and to prevent the situation where the "good" child will be one who puts up with mainstreaming to his personal detriment ("Teachers' Experiences in Massachusetts," 1976).

Kavanagh (1977), Reynolds (1978), and Heron (1978) argue that one reason for poor preparation is often lack of communication. Proper communication among all concerned can only help the mainstreamed child. Duplications can be avoided and strengths and weaknesses concentrated on.

Where resources are limited, teachers may very well have a right to refuse placement of handicapped children in inappropriate settings. Teachers may begin to argue more strongly against implementation of a program where needs have been identified but not provided for. In the future, this may become an issue for contract negotiations (Hunter, 1978).

A list of ten teacher's rights concerning education of the handicapped was recently published ("Teacher's Rights in P.L. 94-142," 1978). These apply to both children and special education professionals, and express the importance of preparation for implementation. They are the rights of:

1) adequate student diagnosis;
2) participation in the program planning process;
3) having the student only for the smallest portion of the day needed for special education;
4) working with trained regular classroom instructional personnel;
5) the provision of adequate resources to serve the child;
6) training in new techniques;
7) supervision and training of ineffective colleagues;
8) having facilities and resources in the special education program comparable to the general education program;
9) receiving the assistance of parents in complementing the school program at home;
10) participation in the system-wide planning process in which statewide resources are allocated.

Although there were many arguments supporting the notion that preparation for mainstreaming has been poor, the literature does not support the argument that regular classroom teachers are "against" the mainstreaming concept.

Kavanagh (1977) states that the majority of teachers are not unwilling to fulfill the mainstreaming mandate, but can only do so much. However, teachers will oppose programs that do not take the realities of the classroom into consideration. Cruickshank (1977) does not want to harm the handicapped child more by not adequately preparing for mainstreaming; he has called for evidence that mainstreaming will work. Parent pressure and legal threats may be counterproductive in the long run; Rausher (1976) concurs.

Claims have been made that mainstreaming has been going on for years. Diebold (1978) explains how she always used to teach according to the ability of the child and without the support which can be expected today. She is confident that mainstreaming will work.

It is difficult to state definitively that in-service training will always improve a regular classroom teacher's ability to integrate the mainstreamed child into his classroom successfully. Some teachers may be capable of accepting a mainstreamed child without any in-service training. Conversely, it can be shown that at least one group of teachers did not perceive their particular transition program to be successful for either themselves or their children (MacMillan, 1978).

Harasymiw and Horne (1976) take a modified approach. Teacher attitudes on integration issues can be modified through an in-service program and new knowledge about the handicapped can be given. However, it may be more difficult to change basic social (distance) attitude sets. Variables such as age, degree earned, sex, teaching ability, positiveness of attitude toward mainstreaming, number of special education courses previously taken, length of time spent teaching, and year last degree was earned may all affect the type of in-service program needed (Harasymiw and Horne, 1975). Teachers' personality characteristics in relation to their sterotypical expectancies of different types of handicapped children may also need to be considered (Severence, 1977; Foster & Keech, 1977; Helton & Oakland, 1977; and Gottlieb & Gottlieb, 1977).

Proctor (1967) and Glass and Meckler (1972) give the impression that most regular classroom teachers perceive orientation programs to be beneficial. Training designed to develop knowledge and understanding about exceptional children is greeted with enthusiasm; after workshop sessions, trainees often felt increased competence in instructing the mainstreamed child. Significant differences between experimental and control groups with regard to the amount of special education information learned and perceptions of the potential for integrating handicapped students into regular classroom activities exist (Yates, 1973).

In addition to in-service programs, Gickling and Theobald (1975), Moore and Fine (1978), Kavanagh (1977), Reynolds (1978), and Mandell and Strain (1978), submit that teachers need both resource individuals and aides to help them. Since the mainstreamed child requires more contact time in the classroom, it is generally believed that the regular classroom teacher needs resource individuals to help them for this reason alone.

In-service programs and workshops are not designed to turn all teachers into special education teachers. There is still a need for resource specialists to help plan the Individual Education Plans. In addition, aides will be necessary to support both the regular and special education teachers.

Job Satisfaction

The conceptual study of job satisfaction is relatively new originating in the early 1930s. Most of the early work is based on the influence of job satisfaction on measurable variables in the industrial setting. Lawler supports this view:

> While psychology was under the influence of behaviorism, psychologists avoided doing research that depended on introspective self-reports. Behaviorists strongly felt that if psychology were to develop as a science, it had to study observable behavior. Since satisfaction is an internal subjective state by people experiencing it, satisfaction was not seen as a proper subject for study. (1973, p.61)

The earliest works on job satisfaction are Hoppock's now famous monograph on job satisfaction (1935) and the Western Electric Studies by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1947). It is not the purpose of this section to study the effects of satisfaction with a job, but to examine the conceptual basis for that concept. Therefore, much of the early work which focused on the effects of job satisfaction on performance, turnover, and absenteeism is omitted.

Since job satisfaction - or more generally satisfaction - is an internal, non-observable state, very little theoretical basis for the state has been developed. Lawler (1973) believes that:

> The research on job satisfaction has typically been atheoretical and has not tested for causal relationships. Since the research has not been guided by theory, a vast array of unorganized, virtually uninterpretable facts have been unearthed.(p.63)

Early theoretical work on satisfaction was confined to the realms of motivational or need theory. Initial work done in the 1940s was reported by Abraham H. Maslow in 1954. Maslow's theory consists of a series of basic motivational concepts in which human needs are studied in relation to each other and are arranged in a hierarchy of importance. Maslow emphasized the idea of prepotency; that is, lower level needs must be satisfied before the next level of need is desired or becomes a motivator. McGregor described the basic concept as:

> Man is a wanting animal - as soon as one of his needs is satisfied, another appears in its place. This process is unending. It continues from birth to death. Man's needs are organized in a series of levels - a hierarchy of importance. A satisfied need is not a motivator of behavior,(1960, pp.36-39)

Maslow originally listed physiological needs as the lowest level of human need. Both Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971) and Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) used Porter's (1962) variation on the original hierarchy. Porter replaced physiological needs with needs labeled autonomy, since most physiological needs are fulfilled in modern society. The modified hierarchy from lowest to highest was reported, then, as security needs, social needs, esteem needs, autonomy needs, and self-actualization.

Concerned with the needs of public school teachers and working under an assumption that the larger the perceived need deficiency the higher the index of dissatisfaction, Sergiovanni and Starratt reported a study based on an earlier work by Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966). Educators were asked to respond to a thirteen item need deficiency questionnaire modelled after Maslow's theory:

> For each item respondents were asked to indicate: (1) how much of the particular characteristic was presently available in their jobs (actual), and (2) how much of this same characteristic they thought should be available in their school positions (ideal). Responses were given on a seven point scale with the item's need deficiency score determined by subtracting actual response from ideal response.(Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1971, p.139)

It must be noted that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were measured in relation to need fulfillment, not in relation to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The job only served as a setting for the measurement of needs; such needs may be influenced by many other factors.

This technique was used again in a study by Carver and Sergiovanni (1968). Fifteen hundred ninety-three high school teachers responded to the Maslow-based need deficiency index. Results interpreted by Sergiovanni and Starratt indicate that:

> ...while teachers are generally well satisfied with the two lower order needs, they express appreciably less satisfaction with respect to the three higher order needs. While the trend in need deficiency tends to follow that proposed by Maslow, the least satisfaction for these high school teachers was reported for esteem.(1971, p.142)

It is important to remember that these results do not represent views on job satisfaction, but views on need deficiencies. In fact, the job setting in the study served only to restrict the population from which the sample was drawn.

Conceptually, Maslow's theory is a motivational or drive theory for the entire human state. Although the job setting and characteristics may be part of a total need concept, they cannot be considered the unique factors of influence as a need may be satisfied outside the job by participation in civic organization, creative and published writing, or security from inherited wealth.

Maslow's basic concept of human needs, however, stimulated prolific writing during the 1950s and 1960s on the needs of the individual relative to his job. The research was intended to identify the factors that were related to the feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction and to demonstrate a causal relationship. This particular thrust was criticized recently by Saloncik and Pfeffer (1977). After studying the research, they concluded that:

> The evidence and argument in this examination indicates that the need-satisfaction model must be seriously re-examined, and does not warrant the un-questioning acceptance it has attained in organizational psychology literature. As the model is formulated, it is difficult to disprove...
>
> The principal concepts of the model-needs and job characteristics are both open to serious questioning and to alternate interpretations. The calculus relating needs to job satisfaction, through the mechanism of job characteristics, has not been well specified. Where needs originate, their stability and their usefulness as concepts for explaining behavior in a predictive fashion, remain important questions.(p.453)

The initial job satisfaction research in the 1950s was characterized by two distinct approaches. First, there was the belief that factors related to job satisfaction were arranged on a conceptual continuum. This concept, which is regarded as the traditional approach, has as its basic assumption the fact that a factor or set of factors that led to dissatisfaction could also lead to satisfaction, and vice-versa. The second major thrust was by Fredrick Herzberg (1959) who developed the "motivation-hygiene theory" also referred to as the "dual-factor theory." Herzberg's basic notion rests on the assumption that the factors which lead to satisfaction would not necessarily lead to dissatisfaction. Although these thrusts differ conceptually, they both originate from the basic need concepts of the 1930s and 1940s.

The traditional theory of job satisfaction was initiated in 1953 when Schaffer stated that "job satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can be satisfied, are actually satisfied" (p.65). Referred to by Lawler (1973) as a fulfillment theory, it was supported by the work of Victor Vroom in 1964. Vroom used the notion of valence to explain the degree to which a job provides the person with positively valued outcomes.

Continued development of the traditional theory and the causal variables may have originated from ideas expressed by March and Simon in 1958. Defining job satisfaction in terms of perceived desirability of movement, March and Simon attempted to specify the psychological mechanisms that operate to produce work satisfaction. They stated three major propositions:

> First, the greater the conformity of the job characteristics to the self-characterization held by the individual, the higher the level of satisfaction. Dissatisfaction arises from a disparity between reality and the ego-ideal held by the individual. The greater the disparity, the more pronounced the desire to escape from the situation.
>
> Second, the greater the predictability of instrumental relationships on the job, the higher the level of satisfaction. Ability to predict the cost of attaining a specified volume of production would be an example of such predictability in the job of factory manager.
>
> Third, the greater the compatibility of work requirements with the requirements of other roles, the higher the level of satisfaction. As Curle (1949) has pointed out, one of the major reasons for interpersonal differences in work satisfaction is that groups in a society do not always make mutually compatible demands on the individual worker. One would predict that an organizational participant would try to select his group memberships so as to keep at a low level the conflict imposed by differences in the demands made upon him.
>
> Each of the three propositions specifies prior conditions for decision-making conflict; to the extent that withdrawal from one of the groups in the situation represents a solution to this type of conflict, we can infer the relations we have specified.(pp.94-95)

It must be noted that the propositions of March and Simon are based on the assumption that job satisfaction may be measured as a person's perceived desire to move from a particular job setting. This particular relationship of job satisfaction to turnover has been supported in the literature (Hoppock, 1935; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1947).

To account for various criticisms of the fulfillment theory, discrepancy and equity theories were developed in the 1960s based on a traditional approach. Lawler (1973), in a review of the discrepancy approach, stated that the discrepancy theory "maintains that satisfaction is determined by the difference between the actual outcomes a person receives and some other outcome level" (p.66). Other outcomes may be what one feels should be received or what one expects to receive. The fact that there is a difference has been supported by some (Wanous & Lawler, 1972). Katzell (1964), Locke (1969), and Porter (1962) are credited with work utilizing this approach.

Another variation on the concept is centered around "equity," or sometimes referred to as inequity theory. Lawler (1973) observed:

> Adams (1953, 1965) argues in his version of equity theory that satisfaction is determined by a person's perceived input-outcome balance in the following manner: the perceived equity of a person's rewards is determined by his input-outcome balance; this perceived equity in turn determines satisfaction. Satisfaction results when perceived equity exists, and dissatisfaction results when perceived inequity exists. Thus, satisfaction is determined by the perceived ratio of what a person receives from his job relative to what a person puts into his job.(p.69)

An important insight by Lawler (1973) is that equity theory emphasizes the importance of other people's input-outcome balance, whereas discrepancy theory is vague about how people decide what their outcomes should be.

It should be noted that these are theories of job satisfaction which are based on the perceptual needs of the individual. Lawler (1973) identified two determinants of satisfaction based on related research. First, there is a relationship between satisfaction and the characteristics of the job. Second, there is a relationship between satisfaction and the characteristics of the person. The difficulty arises when one tries to operationalize the concept of job satisfaction. Recognizing this problem, Lawler (1973) stated:

> Because of these methodological complexities, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the number of workers who are or are not satisfied with their jobs or with some facet of their jobs. This drawback does not mean, however, that meaningful research on satisfaction is impossible. On the contrary, interesting and important research has been and can be done on the determinants of job satisfaction. For example, the relationship between personal-input factors - such as education level, sex, and age and seniority - and job or facet satisfaction can be ascertained by simply comparing those people who report they are dissatisfied and checking the results to see if the two groups differ in any systematic manner. The number of people reporting satisfaction is not crucial for this purpose. What is more important is that we distinguish those people who tend to be less satisfied. This distinction can be made with many of the better-known satisfaction-measuring instruments, such as the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) and Porter's (1961) need-satisfaction instrument·(p.80)

In an attempt to determine some specific relationships of particular variables to specific areas of job satisfaction, factor analytic techniques have been used to distinguish various facets of job satisfaction. One example is evidenced by the five factors identified in the development of the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, et.al., 1969). Another attempt to derive facets from sixty-eight variables which were designed to identify overall satisfaction was based on a sample of eighty public school teachers (Holdaway, 1978). Factor analysis of the responses revealed affiliation between overall satisfaction and societal attitudes, status, recognition, achievement, career orientation, and stimulation.

Lawler (1973) developed a conceptual model for job facet satisfaction. The model was based on both equity and discrepancy theory. Satisfaction was measured in terms of a difference of which one element of the difference was what the person perceives he actually receives. The second element of the difference was what the person feels he should receive. "Should" was usually less than "actual" and usually more consistent with feelings on the job. The basic theme underlying the model is that one should understand what determines a person's satisfaction with any facet of the job. The underlying assumption is that the same psychological processes operate to determine satisfaction with job factors ranging from pay to supervision, to satisfaction with the work itself. Satisfaction with each job factor, therefore, is determined by the difference between how much of the factor there is and how much of the factor the person feels there should be. Lawler (1973) cautioned:

> A number of studies have tried to determine the amount of employee dissatisfaction that is associated with different job facets. Although these studies have yielded interesting results, some serious methodological problems are involved in this work. As with overall satisfaction, factors such as type of measurement scale used and manner of wording questions seriously affect the number of people who express dissatisfaction with a given facet. (p.74).

Obtaining a value for overall satisfaction from a facet model may be difficult. Vroom (1964) believed that overall satisfaction was the sum of the products of the value obtained from the facet satisfaction and the facet importance for all facets. Lawler (1973) argued that "actually measuring importance and multiplying it by measured facet satisfaction often isn't necessary because the satisfaction scores themselves seem to take importance into account" (p.78). It might be noted that the most widely used facet measure, the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, et al., 1969) does not suggest determining an overall satisfaction score.

An alternative to the traditional approach of job satisfaction originated in 1959 when Fredrick Herzberg, Bernard Mausner, and Barbara Snyderman presented the motivation-hygiene concept of job attitudes in their book The Motivation to Work. Herzberg (1966) stated that the study was "designed to test the concept that man has two sets of needs, his need as an animal to avoid pain, and his need as a human to grow psychologically" (p.71). The original sample consisted of two hundred engineers and accountants, who represented a cross section of a Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, industry. In a personal interview, each individual was asked about events experienced at work which either had resulted in a marked improvement in job satisfaction or had led to a marked reduction in job satisfaction. Analysis identified five factors as strong determinants of job satisfaction: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement - the last three being of greater importance for lasting change of attitudes. Herzberg noted that these five factors appeared very infrequently when the respondents described events that paralleled job dissatisfaction feelings. Factors involved in the job dissatisfaction events were an entirely different set of factors. Job dissatisfaction factors were things like company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions. Herzberg (1966) stated:

> The principal result of the analysis of this data was to suggest that the hygiene or maintenance events led to job dissatisfaction because of a need to avoid unpleasantness; the motivator events led to job satisfaction because of a need for growth or self-actualization. At the psychological level, the two dimensions of job attitudes reflected a two-dimensional need structure: one need system for the avoidance of unpleasantness and parallel need system for personal growth.(p.75)

In summary, Herzberg (1966) noted two essential findings that were derived from his initial study:

> First, the factors involved in producing job satisfaction were separate and distinct from factors that led to job dissatisfaction. Since separate factors needed to be considered, depending on whether job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction was involved, it followed that these two feelings were not the obverse of each other. Thus, the opposite of job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction

> but rather no job satisfaction; similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction, not satisfaction with one's job. The fact that job satisfaction is made up of two unpolar traits is not unique, but it remains a difficult concept to grasp.(pp.75-76)

Verification of the dual-factor theory seems to be a crucial point. Herzberg (1966) detailed in his book, Work and the Nature of Man, replications of his work; but a review of other studies demonstrates that, in most cases, not all factors prove significant as either hygienes or motivators.

Vroom (1964) made the following observation:

> It is still possible that obtained differences between stated sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction stem from defensive processes within the individual respondent. Persons may be more likely to attribute the causes of satisfaction to their own achievements and accomplishments on the job. On the other hand, they may be more likely to attribute their dissatisfaction, not to personal inadequacies or deficiencies, but to factors in the work environment, i.e., obstacles presented by company policies or supervision.(p.119).

Edward Holdaway (1978) referred to a similar statement by Wolf which implies that people tend to remember and attribute causes of satisfaction to themselves, and causes of dissatisfaction to the environment. This particular criticism is a conceptual attack on the methodology used by Herzberg. The criticisms suggest that the interview technique elicits particular response patterns from people. These patterns, therefore, tend to explain measures of dissatisfaction as "outside themselves" and satisfaction measures as personal attributes. From a perceptual viewpoint, the interview responses of the individual at that particular time (assuming the person is honest in responding) represent truth to that individual. Conceptually, the interview technique should provide accurate responses, since it does represent the perceptual views of the individual and does not force these views into a written, standardized form of a questionnaire.

In a study by Bobbitt and Behling (1972) that was designed to support Vroom's defense-mechanism criticism, the authors hypothesized that individuals attribute favorable outcomes to their own actions and unfavorable outcomes to factors beyond their control. The results of the study did not support the hypothesis thus providing doubt about the validity of the criticism.

The most valid question is whether Herzberg's theory works. In support of its effectiveness, Thomas Sergiovanni (1967) conducted a study of seventy-one teachers in Monroe County, New York. Although some of the factors appeared to be bi-polar, possessing the potential to contribute to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, Sergiovanni (1967) concluded that factors which appeared as sources of high job feelings for teachers tended to differ from factors which appeared as sources of low job feelings. A similar study by Schmidt (1976) with seventy-four high school administrators supports the dual factor theory even though not all factors were significant contributors.

Other attempts at replication have proven to be less supportive. For example, Orpen (1975) conducted an empirical study with black factory workers in South Africa. After investigation, he concluded that Herzberg's theory is both occupation and culture bound. Furthermore, in a study to test the theory at different organizational levels, Cummings (1974) determined that work values do change as one moves upward in the organizational hierarchy. The hygiene factors seem more important with work groups near the bottom, whereas the motivational factors seem more important near the top. This particular study may lend support to Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory. In an earlier study by Ewen (1964), it was noted that the theory only provides partial description of those elements in the total work environment.

An investigation of some recent studies designed to support the motivator-hygiene theory using the same methodology also led to questionable results. Manning (1976) conducted a replication study with thirty-two superintendents in Virginia. The results indicated that Virginia superintendents identify the Herzberg motivator, work itself, as a hygiene factor. The theoretical hygiene factor, interpersonal relations-school board, was identified as a motivator. Interpersonal relations-central office staff, job security, salary and personal life were not identified as either hygiene or motivator factors. Only achievement and recognition were found to be statistically significant motivators. Working conditions was the only hygiene factor that was statistically significant. Wainwright (1977) reported a replication attempt with fifty high school principals. Like Schmidt's, his evidence was inconclusive. Achievement and recognition were the only two motivators that were found to be statistically significant, while only school district policy and administration, and working conditions proved to be significant hygiene factors. Hall (1977) conducted a similar study with Catholic elementary school principals in May of 1977. The research results of this investigation also fail to support the dual-factor theory. Of the six factors Hall used in her study, only achievement was identified more often as a satisfier than as a dissatisfier. Three factors, recognition, work itself, and possibility of growth, were identified more often as dissatisfiers than as satisfiers. Advancement was cited the same number of times as a satisfier and as a dissatisfier. The factor school system/religious congregation policy and administration was the only factor identified more often as a dissatisfier than as a satisfier. Supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, and personal life were identified more often as dissatisfiers than as satisfiers; status and job security were identified more frequently as dissatisfiers, while salary was not identified as either a dissatisfier or as a satisfier.

Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) stated that they believe the motivation-hygiene theory to be applicable to educational organizations and, indeed, to teachers and students for two reasons. First, the theory is consistent with the humanistic belief pattern which forms one dimension of our applied science of educational administration; second, when the Herzberg hypothesis is tested using teachers and other educators as respondents, results similar to those found for other groups are obtained. This review of current studies raises doubts about the applicability of the theory. House and Wigdor's (1967) review of the literature offers one particular criticism. They conclude that the factors affecting job satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction are different for each individual. They found considerable evidence that what causes satisfaction for one individual need not cause it for another.

Graen and Hulin (1968) tested the dual-factor theory against the more traditional approach of a single continuum of overall job satisfaction-dissatisfaction. The five factors of the Job Descriptive Index were used as a measure of overall satisfaction or overall dissatisfaction for 301 home-office employees. The authors concluded that:

> The results clearly disconfirm predictions of the two-factor theory. The findings that satisfier variables (work itself and promotion) contribute to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction and that the 'dissatisfier' variables (co-workers, supervision, and salary) contribute to satisfaction and not dissatisfaction are incompatible with the two-factor theory.(p.341)

As a follow-up, Graen (1968) conducted another study which incorporated the General Motors Faces Scale as a measure of overall satisfaction, with the variables of the Job Descriptive Index. Graen concluded:

> The results of this study, taken as a whole, must be viewed as damaging to the two-factor theory. To predict four out of six relationships seems discouraging enough; three of the four misses actually were opposite than predicted. In addition, the trends of the means on overall satisfaction for the groups dissatisfied, neutral, and satisfied with the job variables were increasing monotonic and essentially linear, rather than nonlinear as predicted by two-factor theory. In contrast, hypotheses of traditional theory generally were supported in this study. The prediction of increasing linear trends in satisfaction for groups dissatisfied, neutral, and satisfied with regard to job variables, was supported for both the content variables of work itself and promotion and the content variable of pay. These findings held for both males and females with a single exception. (p.370)

In a similar study in 1969 with 160 clerical workers, Waters and Waters found that the results of the correlation analysis and tabluation of responses to open-ended questions were contradictory to the two factor theory, but were consistent with the continuum traditional framework.

The problem with Herzberg's dual-factor theory arises from the broad implications derived from a single study. One major problem is that the analysis of several individuals' responses does not provide for perceptual differences of individuals. Since the responses are the perceptual viewpoints of individuals, they may cluster (appearing to form two distinct categories) depending on the homogeneity of the perceptions of each individual in the sampled population. It may very well be that for each individual, there may be motivators and dissatisfiers (although this is not supported in the present literature), but the specific factors may differ among individuals.

In summary, the theoretical bases of job satisfaction originate from the theory of human needs and motivations in relationship to an individual's job. Conceptually two basic positions have been formulated in the literature. First there is the traditional approach which defines measurements of job satisfaction on a continuum from dissatisfied to satisfied. The second approach is the dual-factor theory, which identifies separate factors relating to satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Based on replication studies and the work of Graen and Hulin (1968), Graen (1968), and Waters and Waters (1969), this review of the literature tends to support the traditional approach.

The major limitation of research on job satisfaction is operationalizing a perceptual concept. The use of factor analysis has indicated that some variables are associated with particular facets of job satisfaction as analysis of perceptual responses are associated with overall job satisfaction, but it fails to define an observable behavior associated with degrees of job satisfaction/dissatissfaction. These methods are available to distinguish between individuals who appear (through their individual responses) to be more satisfied (or less depending on point of origin) than others.

Alienation

Alienation has been investigated so thoroughly, and from so many perspectives, that the term has become almost lost in confusion. Johnson (1973) presents this problem most eloquently in the introduction to his volume on alienation:

> In its use as a general concept, scientific term, popular expression, and cultural motif, alienation has acquired a semantic rightness (and confusion) attained by few words of corresponding significance in contemporary parlance. Few concepts have been subjected to as long a history of associations with diverse disciplines, each contributing its own emphases and meanings. Moreover, although popularization of technical terms is common, the plethora of contexts in which alienation is cited on a colloquial level seems extravagant when compared to other vogue expressions.(p.3)

The discrepancy between perceived reality and a desired state forms the essence of alienation. It could be argued that the literature on alienation begins with the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden. This is one of the first examples of the alienation of people from a desired state. John Calvin continued this theologic tradition, that of seeing man alienated from God through the original sin (Feuer, 1963).

Traditionally, though, examination of the alienation literature begins with Karl Marx. Marxian theory deals with the importance of the separation of the individual worker from the product of his labor. The worker sacrifices power over his immediate reality (i.e., control over production) as soon as he agrees to sell his skill to the entrepreneur instead of selling his product to the consumer. Feuer (1963), in his treatment of Marx, states that "because he was alienated from the product of his labor, man also became alienated from other men" (p.129).

Feuer sees the early writing of Marx as having been influenced by

Ludwig Feuerbach, a German philosopher of the 19th century. According to Feuer, Feuerbach saw alienation as a basically sexual phenomenon:

> ...the alienated man was one who had acquired a horror of his sexual life...[and] religious dogma was the manifestation of this sexual alienation... Alienation in a philosophical sense, that is the denial of the reality of the material world, was the consequence of the religious alienation from sexuality. (Feuer, 1963, pp. 129-130)

When Marx first addresses alienation, according to Feuer, it is in the context of man acting in alienation from his own sexuality. Man was being forced by his social mores to conform to standards of behavior contradictory to his own desires. Marx extended his conception of man's repression of his sexual desires to include his hunger for material posessions. Together with Engels, Marx arrived philosophically at revolutionary socialism, a view based not on sexuality and love but on hatred and anger. For Marx, this radical position might have been a reaction to the hedonistic perspectives of his Feuerbachian days.

The later works of Marx and Engels deal with the revolution of the proletariat, which cannot occur "without the worker being alienated from himself, his work, and his society" (Besag, 1966, p.3). Thus, the reasoning behind the proletariat revolution is that:

> 1. through a division of labor comes private ownership;
> 2. with private ownership comes the estrangement of labor from itself and others;
> 3. through the realization that he is not free, the worker becomes frustrated, and he rebels in order to
> 4. restore the unity of work and thereby the unity of all men. (Besag, 1966, p.3)

Marx and Engels seemed to use "alienation" as a motivating force, driving the revolution to the ultimate end of the destruction of the bourgeoise and the termination of the alienated state of the worker. It is ironic that this revolutionary intellectual began his career with the consideration of the alienation of man from his sexual needs.

Six decades after Marx, Durkheim began to wrestle with the apparently polymorphous concept of alienation. Durkheim (1947) considered alienation as a quality of a society described by anomie. Anomie, therefore, was defined as the discrepancy between man's desires and the actual means for achieving these desires, and the patterns for the achievement of these goals as accepted by society. In Besag's view, Durkheim saw man as alienated from his society by a difference in the means of achieving goals. The process of anomic theory follows:

> 1. Under normal circumstances the society is capable of checking the rampant desires of the individual and at the same time to fulfill his needs for success and happiness;
> 2. the society due to its power and the respect in which it is held is the only agency capable of exercising this control over the individual;
> 3. in some instances the society loses the power to control the desire of the individual; and
> 4. under those circumstances, both the society and the individual become alienated. (Besag, 1966, pp. 11-12)

According to this interpretation, only by sheer power of the ordered society is law and order maintained and decision making kept away from the chaotic, driven members of that society.

Examining the causative factors of this conflict with man and society, Merton (1938) points to the "disproportionate accent of goals" present in American society of the period, and states that:

> The sole significant question then becomes, which available means is the most efficient in netting the socially approved value? The technically most feasible procedure, whether legitimate or not, is preferred to the institutionally prescribed conduct. As this process continues, the integration of the society becomes tenuous and anomie ensues. (p. 674)

The import of social norms for achievement is advanced by Merton (1938), and he implies that one of society's major shortcomings is the failure to integrate in the individual the means of achievement with the same fervor as the goals. In response to this social condition, Merton (1938) presents five alternative modes of adjustment for the individual.

	Culture Goals	Institutionalized Means
I. CONFORMITY	+	+
II. INNOVATION	+	-
III. RITUALISM	-	+
IV. RETREATISM	-	-
V. REBELLION	±	±

'+' refers to acceptance of, '-' refers to elimination and '±' refers to rejection and substitution of new goals and standards.

Conformity is defined as the acceptance of the goals and the means of achieving those goals as found in society. Innovation is the acceptance of the goals, but a rejection of the means. Ritualism is the blind performance of the means without concommitant acceptance of the goals they were designed to achieve. Retreatism is the rejection of both the culturally accepted means and goals. The fifth mode of adjustment, rebellion, is different from the other classifications; it is a state of transition. The individual is in a transitional state in rebellion, such that he makes "efforts to clarify the existing structure rather than to perform accommodative actions within the structure" (Merton, 1938, p.676).

As it became more efficient to simplify the tasks of any given worker, it became easier for the worker to lose his perspective of the entire production line. The worker ceased to understand how he fit into the overall design and then felt alienated and forgotten about. Writing after World War II, Mannheim (1949) saw alienation as arising from the fact that:

> ...society increasingly organizes it members with reference to the most efficient realization of ends... there is a parallel decline in the capacity to act intelligently in a given situation on the basis of one's own insight into the inter-relations of events. (p.59).

Leo Srole addresses the question of anomie, too, through the notion of interpersonal alienation or "anomia." Anomia consists of five components. The first, that individuals sense community leaders are detached from and indifferent to individuals' needs, is reflected in the occurrence of an interdependent bond within the social system between the leaders and those they should represent and serve. The second component centers on a person's perception of the social order as essentially fickle and unpredictable. The third component of anomia reflects an individual's view that people are retrogressing from the goals they have already reached. The fourth component, most closely approximating Durkheim's definition of anomie, is seen as the deflation or loss of internalized social norms or values. The final component focuses on the perception that an individual's personal relationships are no longer predictive or supportive. These five components were selected by Srole from a larger series of components which comprise anomia.

Nettler (1957) attempted to clarify the conceptual notions of alienation, anomie, and personal disorganization. She defined these terms as follows:

> 1. anomie refers to a societal condition of relative normlessness;
>
> 2. alienation refers to a psychological state of an individual; and
>
> 3. personal disorganization refers to interpersonal conflict, personal goallessness.(p.671-672)

Seeman (1959) published a study which had a two-fold purpose: (1) to make organized sense of the concept, and (2) to make the concept of alienation more amenable to empirical testing. Seeman proposed that alienation is composed of five variants: powerlessness, normlessness, meaninglessness, social isolation, and self-estrangement.

Powerlessness is defined as "the expectance of probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the outcomes or reinforcements he seeks" (p.784). The roots of powerlessness were traced to the Marxian perspective of the worker in a capitalistic society, such that "the worker is alienated to the extent that the prerogative and means of decision are expropriated by the ruling entrepreneurs" (p.784). The worker feels removed from his work since the decision-making arena is no longer under his control. Powerlessness is a "socio-psychological" phenomenon dealing with the individuals' perceptions of reality as opposed to an objective state. Seeman noted also that powerlessness is a neutral term relative to the value judgment about the society in which the individual lives:

> In this version of alienation, then, the individual's expectancy for control was in clearly distinguished form (a) the objective situation of powerlessness as some observer sees it, (b) the observer's judgment of that situation against some ethical standard, and (c) the individual's sense of a discrepancy between his expectations for control and his desire for control.(p.784)

Seeman did not feel that it was important which perspective was taken in alienation research (individual or society-related) as long as the position was well-defined. Seeman compares powerlessness to the ideas of James and Rotter (1958) on internal vs. external uses of control. Powerlessness according to Seeman is limited to an individual's expectancy of control over socio-political events, "namely, the depiction of man's relation to the larger social order" (p.785). In a later work, Seeman uses (as a measure of powerlessness) a modified internal vs. external control scale developed earlier with Huirant and Rotter (see Rotter et al., 1962). Thus, powerlessness relates in a particular manner, a highly individual-oriented perspective (perceptions of internal vs. external focus of control) and a socially-oriented perspective (perceptions of control over the "political system, the industrial economy, international affairs and the like" (Seeman, 1959, p.785)).

Meaninglessness is defined as occurring when "the individual is unclear as to what he ought to believe - when the individual's standards for clarity in decision making are not met" (Seeman, 1959, p.785). Seeman (1959) paraphrases Mannheim:

> The individual cannot choose appropriately among alternative interpretation (cannot "act intelligently" or "with insight") because the increase in functional rationality with its emphasis on specialization and production, makes such choice impossible.(p.786)

Due to the increase in specialization, the ability to make decisions is lost; decision making implies the ability to see alternative consequences. The individual worker performs, yet loses the understanding of how his performance affects the overall structure of the organization.

Normlessness is easily recognizable from the traditions of Marx and Durkheim. It is defined, according to Seeman (1959) as the point of view "in which there is a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals" (p.787). This definition very neatly follows the description of anomie given above. The research into normlessness, in fact, has usually been directed through the concept of anomie.

Isolation is most often associated with the role of the "intellectual," a person estranged from his society and culture. Isolated individuals "assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society" (Seeman, 1959, p.789). This definition dovetails neatly with Nettler's conceptualization of alienation. Nettler, in measuring "alienation" is, to a large extent, measuring the shared values and interests between an individual and the culture surrounding that person.

Self-estrangement is the last variant proposed by Melvin Seeman. It is similar to the Marxian concept of the worker becoming alienated from self due to the loss of control over his own production. Recognized to be a difficult concept, Seeman tried to express it in a number of ways:

> To be self-alienated...means to be something less than one might ideally be if the circumstances in society were otherwise - to be insecure, given to appearances, conformist;
>
> ...generally characterized as the loss of intrinsic meaning or pride in work, a loss which Marx and others have held to be an essential feature of modern alienation;
>
> ...the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards, that is, upon rewards that lie outside of the activity itself;
>
> ...the inability of the individual to find self-rewarding activities that engage him.(p.790)

A self-estranged individual in a teaching profession might say, "From 7:30 am until 3:30 pm, I'm just playing teacher, I'm not really a teacher: I just play this role so that I can go home and live my own life." This distance of the individual from his work would reflect working not for the inherent satisfaction in the job, but from the income, or from the fact of just being employed. Seeman has taken the most salient theories on alienation and combined them with his own insights, synthesizing a perspective that has affected the alienation literature for two decades.

By 1975, Seeman's theory had expanded to six variants; normlessness was expanded and the notion of cultural-estrangement was created. Seeman noted that Srole's study in which Srole developed a five-item scale for the sister concept (to alienation) of anomie (Srole, 1956) and Dean's normlessness scale (Dean, 1961) were not measures of normlessness in particular. Rather, he said, "all of these scales, whatever their names, are probably best conceived of as measures of generalized discontent (alienation in some global sense) rather than as indices of any specifiable dimension like normlessness" (Seeman, 1975, p.103). The idea of the measurement of alienation in some "global sense" has proven to be worthwhile as a means of assessing alienation through instrumentation.

Self-estrangement in the 1975 review by Seeman has the character of the "...master theme in alienation studies (rather) than simply a variety of it..." (1975, p.104). Seeman again ties self-estrangement to Marx, but then mentions that it bears "an important resemblance to two aspects of interaction that are regularly identified as alienated styles..." (Seeman, 1975, p.105). These two aspects of interaction are later identified as treating others "instrumentally as objects rather than as...whole persons, such instrumental treatment being one of the signs of alienation..." and later, "...a distortion of experience wherein interaction and institutions are transformed with objects and commodities - into "things," or a depersonalization process" (p.195). Here, too, cultural-estrangement was tentatively explained as the individual's denial of commitment to established cultural values.

Most of the literature in the area of alienation in recent years focuses on either attempts to operationalize more adequately the notion of alienation in all its parts or attempts to extend further the concept's application. In fact, Johnson's (1973) perspective of alienation as a vague concept can be found in the introductory paragraph of almost every research article published about alienation within the last five years. The "type" of alienation on which this study concentrates is that of work or worker alienation. Vavrus (1978), in a look at teacher alienation, makes a number of salient points about the degree of alienation of teachers (workers):

> 1. Job satisfaction is generally an inappropriate measure for alienation of labor...(p.13)
>
> 2. ...the notion of alienation, however, is concerned with the intrinsic nature of work and provides a theoretical framework from which to examine the teacher as laborer [italics added] (p.10)
>
> 3. ...if teachers are alientated and have divested themselves from their work,...there may be an inadequate opportunity...to experience such need satisfaction elements as autonomy, creativity, and recognition for achievement. (pp.14-15)

In fact, it is the sense of withdrawal (or, self-estrangement) indicated in this last part, which may explain what characterizes teachers as "burned out."

Summary

The works reviewed above in the areas of role, job satisfaction, and alienation demonstrate both conceptual and empirical descriptions in the literature. Again, it is Argyris (1964) that provides the overall theoretical framework for the study. That is, his P and O theory makes it possible to utilize role and job satisfaction of teachers as the predictors of one of their coping mechanisms, "alienation from work." In a sense, the Personality and Organization theory forms the highest abstraction of the rationale for the study. The concepts of role and job satisfaction operationalize those notions of "personality" and "organization." In the next section of the report, the concepts of role, job satisfaction, and alienation will become even more concrete through the design and use of certain instrumentation.

As discussed above, each of the three concepts can be thought of as unidimensional or multidimensional constructs. It is usual to see such descriptions of dimensionality follow a past to present timeline. That is, one can find most discussions of a concept's unidimensionality early in its literature, and the expansion or recognition of the construct's complexity considered later.

With these constructs, however, care should be exercised in this area, particularly with job satisfaction and alienation. One major reason for this caution extends from theoreticians' inabilities to utilize similarly either unidimensional or multidimensional views, but not to move from one to another and back. As Pacheco (1976) observed, in speaking of alienation:

> What began with Marx as an explicitly normative and value-laden notion of alienation as a tool with which to critically examine objective social conditions and social structure gradually evolves into a concept implicitly used to defend a given social structure — through an implicit assumption of what is normal and the development of the notion of alienated individuals as deviant. (p.7925-A)

In this study, role, job satisfaction, and alienation have been assessed using questionnaires and descriptive research methodology. The next chapter discusses these details.

Three - Research Design and Methodology

The purpose of this investigation was to explore relationships which exist between teachers' perceptions of their role in mainstreaming and of their job satisfaction to their degree of alienation. This section describes the research design and methodology used.

In the first part of this section, the population from which the study sample was drawn and the selected characteristics of the study sample are reported. In the second section, the instrumentation used to operationalize the variables under investigation is discussed. Third, data collection procedures are presented. Finally, in the fourth section of this part, the hypotheses generated and the data analytic techniques used to treat the data are shown.

Population and Sample

Regular education classroom teachers constituted the unit of analysis in this study. The population from which the study sample was drawn included all elementary teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia who were regular education classroom teachers. Since lists of individual teachers were unavailable, principals of elementary schools were used to contact teachers.

Teachers who taught in schools across the state were asked to participate in the study. Principals indicated 950 teachers who were willing to respond to the study questionnaire. (A list of schools in which these teachers were employed is provided in Appendix A.) Of this number, 313 teachers returned usable questionnaires. (The schools at which these teachers who responded to the questionnaire were employed are also indicated in Appendix A.)

Of the teachers in the study sample, more than half (50.7%) were more than 30 years old. Their ages ranged from 22 years to 65 years. The greatest number of teachers (28, or 9.5% of those who responded to this question) were 26 years of age.

As might be expected in using elementary school teachers as the study sample, most were female. In fact, of the respondents to the questionnaire, 90.1% were female and only 8.6% were male. A little over 1% (4 people) did not respond to this item.

In terms of race, over 70% of the study sample were White. Just under 30% of the respondents were Black. The elementary teachers in the study sample had between 1 and 41 years of teaching experience. More than half of them, though, had served 7 years or less as teachers. Over 10% of the respondents indicated they have had 5 years of experience.

Of the study sample, 73.7% have bachelor's degrees and 26.3% have master's degrees. No one who responded to this item indicated having achieved any other advanced degrees. Almost 90% of the degrees were in education-related areas as opposed to strictly academic area degrees. When respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they were working on another degree, over 60% indicated that they were not. Only 3% of the respondents indicated they were working toward their doctorate.

Because this study has such a strong focus on the classroom teacher's role in mainstreaming as one variable, respondents were asked to indicate ways in which mainstreaming may have "touched" them. In terms of formal training/schooling in teaching the mainstreamed child, such as in-service education or degree-credit education, only 33.9% of the respondents said they had had such training. Almost half of those indicated that the training was in-service, as opposed to degree-credit education. Over 90% indicated they had taken either one or two courses for either 3 or 6 credits, respectively. When asked how useful their most recent training had been, almost 90% indicated it had been either very useful or useful. Most people also indicated that they had taken training because they were required to or had wanted to receive the training; only two people indicated they had undertaken such training because of a handicapped child in the family.

In asking members of the study sample whether or not they had ever had children mainstreamed into their classroom, 47.6% responded "yes" and 52% responded "no." Six people did not answer the question.

In terms of whether people felt their role as a regular education classroom teacher had changed, 22% of those responding indicated they thought it had. Over 75%, therefore, thought it had not. When those people who thought the role had changed were asked to list one way in which it had, respondents indicated everything from procedural aspects of the job to physical concerns in the classroom to time management problems. All responses are summarized in Appendix B.

Finally, in terms of selected characteristics of the study sample, respondents were asked to indicate which service (of five), given limited resources, would help them the most in teaching mainstreamed children. Over 40% (43.4%) indicated that an aide would be most help; 26.7% selected a resource teacher; 16.3% chose an in-service program or series of programs; 8.3% thought a consultant would help them most; and 5.2% felt that a psychologist would be of most help.

Thus, if a "composite" picture of a respondent to this study were drawn, the person would be a female elementary regular education classroom teacher. She would be 26 years old, White, and would have had 5 years of teaching experience. The "composite" teacher would most recently have completed a bachelor's degree in an education-related area, but would not be working on another degree. She would have had some formal schooling or training in mainstreaming, most probably one course (three credit hours) regarded as in-service training, which she would consider useful. For the most part, though, she would have taken the training because she wanted to have it. This teacher probably would not have had a child mainstreamed into her class as yet, and thus would not feel as if her role as a classroom teacher had changed. But, if she had to choose one service which would help her implement the mainstreaming mandate, she would rather have an aide than a resource teacher, than in-service training, than a consultant or a psychologist.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire which was mailed to regular education classroom teachers consisted of four parts. The first part served to gather information from respondents regarding certain selected characteristics. The second part required respondents to give perceptions of their role in mainstreaming. The third part asked respondents to indicate their feelings of alienation. Finally, the fourth part required respondents to indicate their job satisfaction.

Questions which were posed to teachers in the first part regarding personal characteristics (such as age, sex, and race), educational background, and mainstreaming were indicated above in the description of the study sample. The rest of this subsection on instrumentation will deal with the role, alienation, and job satisfaction parts. For each, a brief review of the instruments available in the field which tap the necessary dimensions will be given, followed by a discussion of the instruments used in this study.

Role

A search for an instrument with which the teachers responding could indicate how they perceived themselves with respect to mainstreaming a handicapped child into their regular classroom was sought. Approximately 26 instruments were reviewed which had been published previously. Although some seemed likely candidates for use in this study initially, none were found which would tap adequately into a regular educator's perception of her role in mainstreaming. One obvious reason was the newness of the mandate, P.L. 94-142. Another was the concentration on attitudes or opinions about mainstreaming rather than perceptions of role. For example, Mandell and Strain (1978) developed factors which could be used to predict teachers' attitudes. For these reasons, the study team constructed its own instrument.

The "Perceptions of Role in Mainstreaming" instrument (see Appendix C) was constructed following suggestions by Warwick and Lininger (1975), Edwards (1957), and Robinson, et al. (1974). It was decided to develop a mail questionnaire which could be utilized in a self-administering/group situation, too. A return rate of 40% is considered "good" for a mail questionnaire (Warwick & Lininger, 1975). To increase response rates, devices such as addressed return envelopes, the use of first-class mail, personally-typed letters, and a deadline date were used (Roeher, 1963; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963). In addition, a structured response format was employed.

Because of the theoretical framework for the study (P and O theory) and the conceptual bases for role, the development of an instrument which was theoretically based in the literature and research on role became an important dimension. To this end, a summative scale was planned and an item pool was created. Each item was checked against Edwards' criteria (1957). The items were gathered from a review of over 75 pieces of literature and research, most of which are cited in Role in Section Two of this report. Over a number of months, items were written, re-written, and individually evaluated as to their wording (simple? direct? familiar?), clarity (double-barreled? loaded?), specificity, applicability, readability, and length. All of the items in the pool were originally placed into one of three categories:

1. potency, the input of the teacher into the process of mainstreaming;

2. competency, the ability of the teacher to teach the mainstreamed child;
3. adequacy, the type of in-service programs needed to provide skills for teaching the mainstreamed child.

It was thought, however, that four categories would be more useful. That is, all items which dealt with opinions about the mainstreamed child were placed into a fourth category. It was this four-category scheme which then served as the basis for the instrument.

Originally, a six-step Likert scale was planned as suggested in the literature (Bills, 1975) to maximize reliable variance with respect to role in mainstreaming in this study. However, a four-point scale was determined to be sufficient. Because it is suggested in the construction of such instruments as this one that "there is no place for truly neutral statements" (Nunnally, 1967, p.532), a seven-step scale was not utilized. It was felt that providing respondents with an "undecided" or "neutral" scale point would encourage a middle-of-the-road response set in this situation.

Once the item pool was complete, the need to establish reliability and content, construct, and face validity became important. To these ends, a panel of judges of educators familiar with the notion of a regular education classroom teacher's role in mainstreaming was formed to establish content validity. These five people reviewed each of the hundred items in the item pool independently in terms of the four role areas discussed in Section Two of this report:

1. the teacher's perception of self in the process of mainstreaming with relation to his opinions toward the mainstreamed child;
2. the teacher's perception of self in the process of mainstreaming with relation to in-service training;

3. the teacher's perception of self in the process of mainstreaming with relation to competency to teach the mainstreamed child;

4. the teacher's perception of self in the process of mainstreaming with relation to providing input into the mainstreaming process.

Since these four categories were used to guide the development of the items, the sample of items which 80% of the panel placed in the same categories in which they started was considered valid to assess this particular situation. Of the 100 items in the pool, 34 were left after this validation process. In terms of face validity, three members of the study team assured that the items appeared to measure role in mainstreaming.

Once face validity and content validity of the item pool were established, the remaining items were administered to 63 regular education classroom teachers as a pilot test, a similar group of respondents as those which were used for the study.

Analyses of these items were made, and four items were dropped. The 30 which remained constituted the perception of role in mainstreaming part of the questionnaire. The grouping of items appears in Tables 1 - 4. The reliability and construct validity of the instrument were determined as part of the main study, since more subjects were available for construct validation through factor analysis, a technique which is highly recommended (Kerlinger, 1973). Five subjects per item are considered the minimum number necessary for analyses (Nunnally, 1967).

In terms of construct validity, it was assumed that four factors could be culled from a principal factor solution with varimax rotation (orthogonal rotation) which would account for more than 50% of the scale variance. This did not obtain in a clear manner. Several oblique solutions were tried as

Table 1

Role Scale

Opinions Toward the Mainstreamed Child

(R) 11. As a classroom teacher, I feel that the money spent to educate handicapped children would be better spent on educating gifted and talented children.

(R) 14. As a classroom teacher, I feel that I am more apt to reject the mainstreamed child than will his classmates.

16. As a classroom teacher, I feel that I am able to focus upon the mainstreamed child's capabilities, not his "label."

21. As a classroom teacher, I believe that mainstreaming will succeed in integrating "normal" and "special" children in all areas of schooling.

(R) 24. As a classroom teacher, I believe that "special" children were receiving adequate instruction before P.L. 94-142.

25. As a classroom teacher, I believe that we should spend all that is necessary to properly educate children with special needs.

(R) = reverse scoring of item before summing

Table 2

Role Scale

In-Service Training

4. My needs as a classroom teacher should set the framework for my school's in-service programs relative to mainstreaming.

6. As a classroom teacher, I should be given paid time off to undergo training necessary to teach children mainstreamed into my classroom.

13. As a classroom teacher, I want in-service sessions in mainstreaming to be carried out after school.

(R) 15. As a classroom teacher, I feel that in-service programs are of little value in helping me deal with mainstreamed children.

26. As a result of in-service training, I feel that I have become more capable of managing the mainstreamed student in the regular classroom.

30. As a classroom teacher, I believe that paid in-service training should be given after school in the area of mainstreaming.

(R) = reverse scoring of item before summing

Table 3

Role Scale

Competency To Teach Mainstreamed Child

7. As a classroom teacher, I cannot fully minister to the mainstreamed child in a class of 30 youngsters, all of whom need attention.

10. As a classroom teacher, I can only deal with a limited number of children who are to be mainstreamed into my classroom.

18. As a classroom teacher, I feel that I can teach the mainstreamed child as well or better than a special education teacher.

20. As a classroom teacher, I have the skills to teach mainstreamed children in my classroom.

22. As a classroom teacher, I have a positive perception of myself and my role in the process of mainstreaming.

27. As a classroom teacher, I can teach a mainstreamed child as well as any other classroom teacher.

(R) 29. As a classroom teacher, I do not have the skills necessary to eliminate the classroom management problems which result from mainstreaming.

(R) = reverse scoring of item before summing

Table 4

Role Scale

Providing Input into the Mainstreaming Process

1. As a classroom teacher, I have been told exactly what my responsibilities are in the process of implementing P.L. 94-142.

(R) 2. The special education specialist is in charge of the mainstreamed child's advancement; as a classroom teacher, I do what he(she) tells me.

(R) 3. As a classroom teacher, I have not had adequate input into the mainstreaming process in my school.

5. As a classroom teacher, I have been told that I am obligated to fulfill the Individual Education Programs (IEPs).

8. As a classroom teacher, I should tell the special education resource teachers what to include in in-service programs in mainstreaming.

(R) 9. As a classroom teacher, I feel that specialists are now developing in-service programs in mainstreaming with little or no concern for the teachers who must put them into practice.

12. As a classroom teacher, my consent should be necessary before a handicapped child is placed in my classroom for mainstreaming purposes.

(R) 17. As a classroom teacher, I have not had adequate input into the assignment(s) of (a) mainstreamed child(ren) into my classroom.

19. As a classroom teacher, I feel that the NEA, AFT, or some other organization must act in order to insure adequate teacher input into the mainstreaming process.

(R) 23. As a classroom teacher, I believe that the process of mainstreaming will cause much discontent among other classroom teachers.

28. As a classroom teacher, I have not had adequate input into the development and process of mainstreaming programs.

(R) = reverse scoring of item before summing

well. Results of the factor analysis - principal factor with varimax rotation of the role instrument - are presented in Table 5. Except for three items, numbers 1, 5, and 7, a cut-off criterion of .300 for loadings was used. Only 37.4% of the scale variance was accounted for with this solution.

Factor 1 most closely approximates the dimension "opinions toward the mainstreamed child." "In-service" is represented by Factor 2, and "competency" by Factor 4. Although "input into the mainstreaming process" is the only role dimension remaining, Factor 3 illustrates the vaguest of the clusters. Because this role instrument is in the experimental stage, no items were dropped at this time.

The reliability for the instrument was determined by a standardized alpha coefficient, where an alpha coefficient is the average of all possible split-half reliabilities for an instrument; here, $\underline{\alpha} = .61$. Although the four factors which were predicted to emerge did not obtain clearly, scale reliabilities were calculated on the pre-factor analysis parts:

1. opinions toward the mainstreamed child, $\underline{\alpha} = .72$;
2. in-service training, $\underline{\alpha} = .68$;
3. competency to teach mainstreamed child, $\underline{\alpha} = .69$;
4. providing input into the mainstreaming process, $\underline{\alpha} = .76$.

The items which correspond to each factor/part are given in Table 6.

As part of the construction of this inventory, care was taken in dealing with both acquiesence and social desirability factors. Robinson, et al. (1974) offered some suggestions which were followed to assure minimal (if any) problems with acquiesence. Social desirability (Edwards, 1957) was

Table 5

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

Role Instrument

Four Factors

Item	Factor				Communality
	1	2	3	4	
1	.282				.103
2					.012
3					.073
4		.516			.320
5	.287				.094
6		.500			.270
7			-.407		.259
8		.449			.234
9				.254	.222
10		.450	-.370		.378
11				.512	.374
12		.370			.269
13			.351		.130
14				.577	.380
15			.386	.490	.405
16	.384			.543	.539
17			.300		.154
18	-.468				.329
19		-.446			.248
20	.703				.524
21	.530		.370		.485
22	.575				.414
23			.441		.279
24			.362	.303	.233
25				.392	.231
26	.399				.244
27	.625				.445
28			-.408		.233
29	.494				.291
30		.549			.346

Table 6

Distribution of Items on Four Scales of Role Instrument for Reliability Determination

Factor		
1. Opinions toward the Mainstreamed Child		
	Items 18, 20, 22, 27, 29	$\underline{\alpha} = .39$
2. In-service Training		
	Items 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 19, 30	$\underline{\alpha} = .44$
3. Competency to Teach Mainstreamed Child		
	Items 11, 14, 15, 16, 21, 24, 25	$\underline{\alpha} = .69$
4. Providing Input in Mainstreaming Process		
	Items 1, 2*, 3*, 5, 7, 9*, 13, 17*, 23, 26, 28	$\underline{\alpha} = .26$

All $\underline{\alpha} = .59$

* Items which do not contribute to the reliability coefficient

more of a problem, though. After much thought, no lie scale was included for two reasons. First, the literature is not clear as to its validity. A literature research did not turn up any examples where social desirability factors were taken into consideration. Second, discussions with experienced psychometricians supported the perspective that a lie scale would serve little purpose.

In view of the results of the factor analysis reported above, the adequacy of the total score reliability and the experimental nature of the instrument, a total score was used to represent respondents' perception of their role in mainstreaming. Thus, the construct was treated operationally as a unidimensional concept.

Job Satisfaction

The instruments developed to assess the extent of satisfaction or dissatisfaction that a person may have with his job show very little consistency. This lack of uniformity and convergence in measurement is rooted in several factors. First, divergent theories form the foundation for the study of job satisfaction. Therefore, convergence in measurement should not be expected. The second reason rests with the inability of researchers to form an operational definition of a non-observable behavior. As stated by Lawler (1973), job satisfaction is "an internal state of being, a non-observable characteristic" (p.61).

Job satisfaction instruments range in form from open-ended questionnaires and interview schedules to highly sophisticated instruments. One common factor across all the instruments is a lack of the establishment of validity and reliability.

The literature was filled with a multitude of "so-called" job satisfaction instruments and questionnaires. In an attempt to discover an instrument which could be used to assess job satisfaction in this study, the following instruments were considered and rejected:

1. Job Description Questionnaire - developed in 1947 and remains the same; no manual available.
2. Job Choice Inventory - developed primarily for use in refineries.
3. Job Satisfaction Inquiry Blank - developed 1933-1943.
4. Jenkins Job Attitude Survey - developed to describe accident-prone individuals; no reliability.
5. Job Attitude Analysis - designed for employment interviewing and counseling.
6. Activity Vector Analysis - 1945-1972 (Clark). Placement analysis based on personality characteristics related to job success; questionable reliability and validity.
7. S.R.A. Employee Inventory - (Science Research Associates, 1951). Test of attitudes; appears to be a problem with the factors.
8. Nursing Job Satisfaction Questionnaire - primarily designed for nursing services.
9. Job Satisfaction for Those Teaching Higher Education - open-ended questions concerned with higher education instruction.

Four instruments appear to be the most valid and/cr the most widely used. Hoppock's Job Satisfaction Measure (1935), consisting of four questions designed to measure overall job satisfaction, was investigated by McNichols, Stahl and Manley (1978). Associated with the United States Air Force, these researchers were able to use large samples in their investigation. They examined five characteristics of Hoppock's measure which were: (1) distribution, (2) construct validity, (3) concurrent validity, (4) convergent validity, (5) reliability. After detailed investigation, the authors conclude that:

> ...Hoppock's job satisfaction measure appears to have significant utility in contemporary organizational research. The measure performs well when examined in terms of its distribution, construct, convergent, and concurrent validities and reliability. Furthermore, the measure performs consistently when applied to a variety of sample populations including many different job categories, organizational levels, and demographic groupings. The authors consequently suggest its use as a compromise between the lengthy, sophisticated job satisfaction instruments and the unvalidated satisfaction questions often found in survey questionnaires. (p.741)

A second measure of overall job satisfaction appears to be the Porter Need Satisfaction Questionnaire. Based on Maslow's need satisfaction hierarchy, a variation of the Porter Need Satisfaction was used by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971) in their study of teacher satisfaction.

Two other instruments have been used extensively in educational research on job satisfaction. The instruments approach the measurement of job satisfaction from a facet orientation. First, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, developed from 1963-1967 in business and industry, indicates satisfaction with specific aspects of work and work environments. The questionnaire has two editions, a long and short form. The long form is designed to break satisfaction down into 21 scores, 20 of which parallel scores of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire and Minnesota Job Description Questionnaire. The 21 areas which the instrument was designed to measure are: ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical, variety, working conditions, and general satisfaction. The short form consists of three scores designed to indicate intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction. Bledsoe and Brown (1977) studied the factor structure of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and conclude that intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction scores were correlated .74 and apparently are not distinctive factors.

The second widely used measure of job satisfaction is the Cornell Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendal, & Hulin, 1969). It is designed to measure five areas of job satisfaction: satisfaction with work, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with opportunities for promotion, satisfaction with supervision and satisfaction with co-workers. The authors indicate that these categories were arrived at after considerable review of the factor-analytic literature on job satisfaction, and after an extensive analysis of their own preliminary categories. Smith (1974) indicates that the JDI yields measures of five different aspects of job satisfaction which are discriminably different from each other. The average correlation among the different scales is approximately .37, low enough to indicate discrimination in the five areas. The scales also correlate with other measures of satisfaction, on the average ($\underline{r} = .70$), and are affected in the expected directions by worker, job, and situational differences. The JDI has been used extensively in the literature and has been referred to as the most carefully constructed and reliable instrument available for measurement of job satisfaction (Ronen, 1977).

Smith (1974) discusses various aspects of the scoring procedure of the JDI as a means of defending the a priori, non-balanced method currently in use. Each scale yields a score. Internal consistency reliabilities of the scales, as determined by split-half procedures, range from .80 to .88.

Participants in this study were asked to indicate responses to only three of the five JDI scales: supervision, work, and people. These scales and directions for answering are found in Appendix C questions 50-52. For each adjective in each scale, respondents were requested to indicate "Y," if the eighteen word items describe that aspect of his work, "N," if the word items do not describe an aspect of his work, and "?," if the respondent could not decide. Scores were assigned in the following manner—Y = 3, N = 0, ? = 1—if the descriptor was positive; vice versa if negative.

Using the respondents in this study, alpha coefficient reliabilities were calculated for scale and total scores on these questions. For the scale Supervision, $\alpha = .87$; for Work, $\alpha = .82$; and for People, $\alpha = .89$. A total score alpha coefficient approached $\alpha = .86$, although Smith (1974) strongly suggests using scale scores, not a total score, for data analytic purposes.

In factor analyzing the three JDI questions which were used in this study, a three-factor solution (varimax rotation) was obtained as expected. However, only 33.6% of the scale variance was accounted for in the analysis. Results of the factor analysis are given in Table 7. JDI Items 1-18 (except 16) carry loadings greater than .300 on the Supervision factor (as does item 54). Items 19-36 (except 26, 32, 34, and 35) carry loadings greater than .300 on the Work factor (as does item 40). And, Items 37-54 carry loadings greater than .300 on the People factor.

Alienation

Instrumentation in this area suffers from the same vagueness and confusion documented in the theoretical arena. Alienation from work or from fellow workers in this study is measured by the Alienation Scale developed by Adams (1969). Actually, the scale is made up of three subscales: Power-

Table 7

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

JDI-Work, Supervision, People

Item	Factor			Communality
	1	2	3	
JDI01		.449		.254
JDI02		.608		.398
JDI03		.515		.293
JDI04		.520		.301
JDI05		.615		.390
JDI06		.308		.184
JDI07		.614		.436
JDI08		.309		.183
JDI09		.451		.216
JDI10		.408		.252
JDI11		.709		.530
JDI12		.544		.309
JDI13		.636		.482
JDI14		.551		.327
JDI15		.457		.257
JDI16				.002
JDI17		.527		.383
JDI18		.407		.191
JDI19			.523	.278
JDI20			.361	.134
JDI21			.648	.450
JDI22			.435	.223
JDI23			.617	.409
JDI24			.535	.316
JDI25			.461	.349
JDI26				.073
JDI27			.667	.496
JDI28			.546	.362
JDI29			.418	.202
JDI30			.468	.231
JDI31			.578	.361
JDI32				.010
JDI33			.410	.190
JDI34				.033
JDI35				.038
JDI36			.653	.501

Table 7 (continued)

Item	Factor			Communality
	1	2	3	
JDI37	.532			.377
JDI38	.657			.457
JDI39	.675			.477
JDI40	.386		.311	.246
JDI41	.568			.338
JDI42	.492			.262
JDI43	.308			.155
JDI44	.551			.338
JDI45	.587			.380
JDI46	.530			.353
JDI47	.517			.299
JDI48	.685			.509
JDI49	.661			.461
JDI50	.369			.159
JDI51	.457			.297
JDI52	.584			.392
JDI53	.513			.339
JDI54	.423	.385		.339

lessness, Involvement, and Social Isolation. The scale is presented in Table 8. The first and third of these subscales are from another alienation instrument, Scale for Measuring Alienation (Dean, 1961). The second subscale is from Moeller (1962).

Powerlessness is the same concept as that which is based upon Marxian theory, regarding "the worker's 'separation' from effective control over his economic destiny" (Dean, 1961, p.754). Normlessness is viewed conceptually as Durkheim's anomie. The notion of social isolation is also linked with Durkheim's anomie, referring to the "feeling of separation from the group" (Dean, 1961, p.755).

There are nine items on the Powerlessness and Social Isolation scales and six items on the Normlessness scale in the original version. Content validity was established by a panel of seven experts who were requested to judge each statement as to its applicability to the component of Powerlessness, using a one page description as criterion. This process was repeated for the other two components Normlessness and Social Isolation. "For retention of an item, agreement on the part of at least five of the seven judges was required, with no judge placing the item in more than one category," (p.756) according to Dean (1961). Reliability coefficients for the three scales ranged from .73 to .84 as reported in the literature.

Williams (1977) used the Alienation Scale in a study of junior high school teachers. He contended that the scale had no established, documented validity. He utilized a panel of judges to establish content validity of the scales, and a series of factor analyses to determine the questionnaire's construct validity. In addition, he calculated alpha coefficient reliabilities for each of the scales. Since his population consisted of urban, junior high

Table 8

Alienation Scale

31. Sometimes I feel all alone in the school.

32. I worry about the future facing today's youth.

(R) 33. A teacher such as myself usually can find ways to get systematic policies changed if he(she) feels strongly about them.

(R) 34. Most teachers in this school seldom feel lonely.

35. Sometimes I have the feeling that the principal and other teachers are using me.

36. Teachers here feel they have little say about important systemwide policies relating to teaching.

37. A teacher such as myself feels he(she) does not know what is going on in the upper levels of administration.

(R) 38. Real friends are as easy as ever to find.

39. It is frightening to be responsible for the development of a teenager.

40. A teacher such as myself never has a chance to work on school committees which make important decisions for the school system.

41. There are so many decisions that have to be made today that sometimes I could just "blow up."

(R) 42. One can always find friends if he(she) himself(herself) has a friendly manner.

43. There are few dependable ties between teachers anymore.

(R) 44. The world in which we live is basically a friendly place.

45. There is little chance for promotion in this school system unless a person gets a "break."

46. We are so regimented today that there is not much room for choice even in personal matters.

Table 8 (continued)

(R) 47. Teachers are just naturally friendly and helpful.

48. The future looks very dismal.

49. I do not get to visit other teachers as often as I would really like.

(R) = reverse scoring of item before summing

school teachers, and this study was concerned with urban, suburban, and rural elementary school teachers, psychometric properties (other than content validity) for the scale were sought utilizing this study sample.

Reliability coefficients of $\underline{\alpha} = .68$, $\underline{\alpha} = .66$, $\underline{\alpha} = .65$, and $\underline{\alpha} = .77$, for the Social Isolation, Involvement, and Powerlessness scales, and for a total (summated) scores, respectively, are reported by Williams (1977). They compare favorably but are not as high as those obtained in this study (see Table 9). However, the 19 items which comprise this scale load differently on a factoranalysis than they did with junior high school teachers responding. The results of the principal factor, varimax rotation solution utilizing the study sample, are show in Table 10. However, only 43.9% of the variance was accounted for using this three-factor solution.

In view of the results of the factor analysis and because of the potential for dealing conceptually with alienation as a unidimensional construct, no further analyses were performed on the instrument. Also, reviews of several instruments in the area of alienation - Srole (1956), Christie (to Robinson & Shaver, 1973), Pearlin (1962), and Clark (1959) - provide evidence for the use of a one-factor, all-inclusive measure of work(er) alienation. Adams' (1969) scale, therefore, was used as a summated scale to assess the alienation of regular education classroom teachers in this study.

Table 9

Distribution of Items and Reliabilities
for Scales and Total Alienation Instrument

Factor

1. Social Isolation
    Items 31, 34, 35, 38, 42, 43, 44, 47 — $\underline{\alpha} = .75$

2. Powerlessness
    Items 32, 39, 41, 46, 48 — $\underline{\alpha} = .72$

3. Involvement
    Items 33, 36, 37, 40 — $\underline{\alpha} = .69$

All $\underline{\alpha} = .83$

Table 10

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

Alienation Scale

Item	Factor			Communality
	1	2	3	
31	.390	.422		.332
32			.612	.382
33		.454		.235
34	.339	.390		.268
35	.335	.428		.362
36		.746		.593
37		.571		.361
38	.525			.333
39			.563	.339
40		.470		.275
41			.599	.435
42	.512			.272
43	.592			.387
44	.643			.421
45		.451		.367
46	.346	.367	.479	.484
47	.473			.227
48	.453		.366	.368
49				.023

Data Collection Procedures

As each part of the survey instrument was being prepared, principals of the elementary schools which became members of the sample were sent a letter requesting the participation of their teachers in this study. The letter appears in Appendix E. With the letter, a form (see Appendix F) was enclosed on which principals could indicate the number of teachers in their school who would be surveyed, and the name, address, and phone number for the school. In addition, a self-addressed, stamped envelope and a copy of the instrument were included to aid principals in responding. Such a strategy has been shown to increase response rates of mail questionnaires (Warwick & Lininger, 1975).

When responses from principals were received, another packet consisting of the instrument and a "thank-you-for-participating" letter (see Appendix G) were mailed to all teachers in each school. An addressed envelope was included in this package, too. Also, as can be seen in the letter in Appendix G, a definite due date for the return was set, as suggested in the literature (Warwick & Lininger, 1975).

As the questionnaires were received from teachers, each one was given an identification number. Through this number, individual respondents as well as the schools in which they work could be known. To assure confidentiality of the information supplied by respondents, names of schools and/or respondents were not retained. Although data can be retrieved by individual and by school, particular schools cannot be identified. (Identification by school was done to provide for a possible secondary analysis using the school as the unit of analysis and for initial analyses testing for differences among schools relative to certain variables, as reported below.)

Approximately four days after the completed questionnaires were due in the hands of the researchers, telephone calls were made to those who had not responded. In most instances, however, the school year had concluded, and teachers were not willing to fill out the instruments.

Hypotheses and Treatment of the Data

One major null hypothesis and three minor null hypotheses were generated from their respective working hypotheses and research questions. The null or statistical hypotheses, in fact, are contrary to what this investigation hoped to demonstrate. Rejecting the null hypothesis is regarded as evidence for the "truth" of the theory predictions developed in Section One of this report.

The following null hypotheses were used in this study:

> H_o: there is no relationship between perceived role in implementing P.L. 94-142 and job satisfaction of classromm teachers and their perceived alienation.
>
> > H_{o1}: there is no relationship between perceived role of classroom teachers in implementing P.L. 94-142 and their perceived alienation.
> >
> > H_{o2}: there is no relationship between perceived job satisfaction of classroom teachers and their perceived alienation.
> >
> > H_{o3}: there is no relationship between perceived role of classroom teachers in implementing P.L. 94-142 and their job satisfaction.

The data were analyzed in three ways. First, responses to each theory-based item on the instrument were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Second, selected characteristics from Section I of the instrument were analyzed using a cross tabulation procedure. Third, hypotheses were tested using multiple regression/correlation (MRC) analysis.

First, however, the data were viewed for problems with multi-collinearity and comparability. With multi-collinearity, the concern is that predictor variables may be highly inter-correlated, thereby increasing variance estimates of the regression coefficients. This nonorthogonality produces other problems as well in MRC, as in the interpretation of the relative contribution of the predictors. Inter-correlations among predictor variables, therefore, were checked, and no high inter-correlations were found which would affect the MRC.

In attending to comparability problems, multiple one-way ANOVAs were run, testing for significant differences among schools on selected variables. Although eight of these tests were significant, this number was less than the number of significant results which would have obtained by chance alone. At a conceptual level, additionally, it was known that the Commonwealth of Virginia, as a state, had responsibility for implementing P.L. 94-142, thus assuring some parity in procedures across schools and their systems. Thus, teachers were assumed to be perceiving similarly-constructed domains (situations) relative to this study.

Multiple regression / correlation (MRC) analysis is a model for relating a group of different independent (predictor) variables to one dependent (criterion) variable. That is, MRC serves to define a linear combination of independent variables that contribute to the variance of the dependent variable. Here, role and job satisfaction serve as the independent variables and alienation represents the dependent variable.

Each null hypotheses, therefore, was tested using MRC analysis, generating multiple correlation coefficients ($\underline{R}^2$) as well as Pearson Product-Moment correlation ($\underline{r}$). The null hypotheses were rejected, and, therefore the predictions of the study team supported if the coefficients were significant using the .05 level of significance as criterion.

Four - Findings

This study was conducted to examine the relationships of perceived role of classroom teachers in implementing P. L. 94-142 and job satisfaction to their alienation. In this section, the results of the data analyses are presented.

In the first part, responses to each theory-based item on the instrument are reported and appropriate descriptive statistics discussed. The second part of this section contains discussions of the influence of mainstreamed children on certain selected characteristics of the sample from Section I of the instrument. Third, results of the tests of the hypotheses are given.

Responses to Theory-Based Items

The first task in the analysis of data was to determine the basic distributions of responses to each theory-based item on the questionnaire. Information on the distribution, variability, and central tendency of the items is presented in Tables 11, 12, and 13.

Role

Concerning classroom teachers' perceptions of their role in implementing P.L. 94-142, several items of the thirty-item questionnaire appear to have interesting response patterns (see Table 11). Only 46.6% of the teachers who responded indicated that they had been told what responsibilities they have in mainstreaming (Item 1). That means that more than half of the group (53.4%) have not been told of their responsibilities! Almost half of the respondents (46.3%), in addition, felt as if they had not had adequate input into the mainstreaming process in their school (Item 3), or programs (Item 28). In fact, although the mandate requires educational agencies to fulfill IEPs, over 40% (42.8%) of the teachers have not been told of such obligations (Item 5).

Teachers were asked whether they felt money being spent to educate handicapped children would be better spent to educate gifted and talented children; over 85% felt such monies would not be better spent in such a manner (Item 11). They also felt that they would not be more likely to "reject" a mainstreamed child than would his/her classmates (Item 14). Almost 90% of the teachers responded that they could focus on the mainstreamed child, not his/her "label" (Item 16), and over 90% responded that money necessary to educate children with special needs should be spent (Item 25).

Table 11

Percentages and Descriptive Statistics for Role Items*

Rating Scale:
(a) 1. Yes, I strongly believe that it is true or that it would be true.
(a) 2. Yes, I believe that it is somewhat true or that it would be somewhat true.
(b) 3. No, I believe that it is somewhat untrue or that it would be somewhat untrue.
(b) 4. No, I strongly believe that it is untrue or that it would be untrue.

Item	Percentage		$\bar{X}$	S.D.
N = 313	(a)	(b)		
1. As a classroom teacher, I have been told exactly what my responsibilities are in the process of implementing P.L. 94-142.	46.6	53.4	2.7	.97
2. The special education specialist is in charge of the mainstreamed child's advancement; as a classroom teacher I do what he(she) tells me.	51.8	48.2	2.5	.85
3. As a classroom teacher, I have not had adequate input into the mainstreaming process in my school.	53.7	46.3	2.4	.94
4. My needs as a classroom teacher should set the framework for my school's in-service programs relative to mainstreaming.	90.1	9.9	1.6	.73
5. As a classroom teacher, I have been told that I am obligated to fulfill the Individual Education Programs (IEPs).	57.2	42.8	2.4	1.07
6. As a classroom teacher, I should be given paid time off to undergo training necessary to teach children mainstreamed into my classroom.	85.6	14.4	1.6	.84

Table 11 (continued)

Item	Percentage (a)	(b)	$\overline{X}$	S.D.
7. As a classroom teacher, I cannot fully minister to the mainstreamed child in a class of 30 youngsters, all of whom need attention.	87.2	12.8	1.5	.83
8. As a classroom teacher, I should tell the special education resource teachers what to include in in-service programs in mainstreaming.	78.3	21.7	2.0	.80
9. As a classroom teacher, I feel that specialists are now developing in-service programs in mainstreaming with little or no concern for the teachers who must put them into practice.	49.5	50.5	2.4	.85
10. As a classroom teacher, I can only deal with a limited number of children who are to be mainstreamed into my classroom.	95.8	4.2	1.4	.61
11. As a classroom teacher, I feel that the money spent to educate handicapped children would be better spent on educating gifted and talented children.	13.4	86.6	3.3	.82
12. As a classroom teacher, my consent should be necessary before a handicapped child is placed in my classroom for mainstreaming purposes.	72.2	27.8	2.0	.91
13. As a classroom teacher, I want in-service sessions in mainstreaming to be carried out after school.	48.6	51.4	2.7	1.03
14. As a classroom teacher, I feel that I am more apt to reject the mainstreamed child than will his classmates.	11.8	88.2	3.5	.81
15. As a classroom teacher, I feel that in-service programs are of little value in helping me deal with mainstreamed children.	26.2	73.8	3.0	.93

Table 11 (continued)

Item	Percentage		$\bar{X}$	S.D.
	(a)	(b)		
16. As a classroom teacher, I feel that I am able to focus upon the mainstreamed child's capabilities, not his "label."	87.2	12.8	1.8	.73
17. As a classroom teacher, I have not had adequate input into the assignment(s) of (a) mainstreamed child(ren) into my classroom.	52.1	47.9	2.4	.99
18. As a classroom teacher, I feel that I can teach the mainstreamed child as well or better than a special education teacher.	20.8	79.2	3.2	.81
19. As a classroom teacher, I feel that the NEA, AFT, or some other organization must act in order to insure adequate teacher input into the mainstreaming process.	76.4	23.6	2.0	.85
20. As a classroom teacher, I have the skills to teach mainstreamed children in my classroom.	38.7	61.3	2.8	.85
21. As a classroom teacher, I believe that mainstreaming will succeed in integrating "normal" and "special" children in all areas of schooling.	50.8	49.2	2.6	.83
22. As a classroom teacher, I have a positive perception of myself and my role in the process of mainstreaming.	68.7	31.3	2.2	.76
23. As a classroom teacher, I believe that the process of mainstreaming will cause much discontent among other classroom teachers.	62.3	37.7	2.3	.83
24. As a classroom teacher, I believe that "special" children were receiving adequate instruction before P.L. 94-142.	44.1	55.9	2.6	.85
25. As a classroom teacher, I believe that we should spend all that is necessary to properly educate children with special needs.	80.5	19.5	1.8	.83

Table 11 (continued)

Item	Percentage (a)	Percentage (b)	$\overline{X}$	S.D.
26. As a result of in-service training, I feel that I have become more capable of managing the mainstreamed student in the regular classroom.	42.8	57.2	2.8	.85
27. As a classroom teacher, I can teach a mainstreamed child as well as any other classroom teacher.	65.5	34.5	2.3	.86
28. As a classroom teacher, I have not had adequate input into the development and process of mainstreaming programs.	67.7	32.3	2.2	.88
29. As a classroom teacher, I do not have the skills necessary to eliminate the classroom management problems which result from mainstreaming.	50.5	49.5	2.4	.86
30. As a classroom teacher, I believe that paid in-service training should be given after school in the area of mainstreaming.	78.3	21.7	1.9	.89

* All items are scored in appropriate direction

Over 73% of the teachers indicated that they feel in-service programs are of value in helping them deal with the mainstreamed child (Item 15), and over 78% would like to see paid in-service training given after school in the area of mainstreaming (Item 30), or have paid time off for training (Item 6). Fewer than half of the teachers responding to Item 26 indicated that they had become more capable of managing the mainstreamed child in the regular classroom as a result of in-service training which is consistent, in many ways, with "true" responses to Item 13, "...I want in-service sessions in mainstreaming to be carried out after school" (48.6%).

Teachers do seem to have an overall positive feeling about themselves in their role in the mainstreaming process. Almost 70% of those responding indicated a positive perception of themselves and their role (Item 22), and of their capabilities for teaching a mainstreamed child as well as any other classroom teacher (Item 27).

Alienation

Similar patterns of responses by classroom teachers about their degree of alienation in general and as applied to the school situation were found (see Table 12) as related to the Role responses. They disagree that "real friends are as easy as ever to find" (71.6%, Item 38), and agree that they worry about the future facing children (84.3%, Item 32). In terms of school-related objects from whom or which they might be alienated, several emerged.

Although teachers (70.9%) disagree that they feel all alone in the school (Item 31), almost 36% seem to feel that their colleagues in the school feel lonely (Item 34). Only slightly more than half of the respondents 53.7% agreed that teachers are naturally friendly and helpful (Item 47).

Table 12

Percentages and Descriptive Statistics for Alienation Items*

Rating Scale:
(a) 1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
(b) 3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Item	Percentage		$\bar{X}$	S.D.
	(a)	(b)		
N = 313				
31. Sometimes I feel all alone at school.	29.1	70.9	3.0	.88
32. I worry about the future facing today's youth.	84.3	15.7	1.8	.81
33. A teacher such as myself usually can find ways to get systematic policies changed if he(she) feels strongly about them.	37.1	62.9	2.8	.77
34. Most teachers in this school seldom feel lonely.	63.6	36.4	2.3	.80
35. Sometimes I have the feeling that the principal and other teachers are using me.	19.5	80.5	3.1	.86
36. Teachers here feel they have little say about important systemwide policies relating to teaching.	62.3	37.7	2.2	.90
37. A teacher such as myself feels he(she) does not know what is going on in the upper levels of administration.	71.6	28.4	2.1	.82
38. Real friends are as easy as ever to find.	28.4	71.6	2.5	.96
39. It is frightening to be responsible for the development of a teenager.	65.8	34.2	2.2	.88
40. A teacher such as myself never has a chance to work on school committees which make important decisions for the school system.	21.7	78.3	3.0	.84

Table 12 (continued)

Item	Percentage		$\bar{X}$	S.D.
	(a)	(b)		
41. There are so many decisions that have to be made today that sometimes I could just "blow up."	45.4	54.6	2.5	.90
42. One can always find friends if he(she) himself(herself) has a friendly manner.	87.5	12.5	1.8	.72
43. There are few dependable ties between teachers anymore.	25.2	74.8	2.9	.79
44. The world in which we live is basically a friendly place.	77.6	22.4	2.1	.70
45. There is little chance for promotion in this school system unless a person gets a "break."	55.6	44.4	2.4	.86
46. We are so regimented today that there is not much room for choice even in personal matters.	40.3	59.7	2.6	.81
47. Teachers are just naturally friendly and helpful.	53.7	46.3	2.4	.69
48. The future looks very dismal.	21.7	78.3	3.0	.78
49. I do not get to visit other teachers as often as I would really like.	70.6	29.4	2.1	.78

* All items are scored in appropriate direction

The strongest indicators of a high degree of alienation seem to be those that focus on schools as imperfect organizations and systems. According to respondents, they feel they cannot get policies changed if they feel strongly about them. They also feel that "teachers...have little say about important systemwide policies relating to teaching" (Item 36), and that they don't know what's going on in the administration (Item 37). But a high percentage of the respondents (78.3%) indicated that they had opportunities to serve on school committees which make important decisions (Item 40). It may be that the committee structure used in the schools is not seen as providing an appropriate or effective vehicle for teacher input.

Job Satisfaction

On this part of the questionnaire, teachers were asked to indicate which words of a set of eighteen could describe the supervision they got on the job, the work on their job, and the people on their job (see Table 13). In terms of supervision, over 75% of the respondents indicated that the following characteristics were descriptive: not hard-to-please; not impolite; praises good work; tactful; up-to-date; not quick-tempered; not annoying; not stubborn; knows job well; not bad; intelligent; and not lazy. For the most part, these characteristics form a very positive description of this aspect of job satisfaction.

In terms of work on their present job, over 75% of the teachers in the study sample responded that nine characteristics were descriptive of their job. These characteristics included: satisfying; not boring; good; creative; pleasant; useful; challenging; not simple; endless; and gives sense of accomplishment. Generally, these statements were rather positive descriptors of teachers' work on their present job as it relates to job satisfaction.

Relative to people on their present job, teachers indicated somewhat

1.0
4.5
5.0
5.6
6.3
7.1
8.0
2.8
3.2
3.6
4.0
2.5
2.2
2.0
1.1
1.8
1.25
1.4
1.6

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

Table 13

Percentages and Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction Items

Item N = 313	Percentages * N	 ?	 Y
Supervision on Present Job			
Asks my advice	26.8	7.7	65.5
Hard to please	78.0	9.6	12.5
Impolite	89.5	3.5	7.0
Praises good work	17.9	6.4	75.7
Tactful	13.4	8.6	78.0
Influential	13.4	24.3	62.3
Up-to-date	8.6	7.3	84.0
Doesn't supervise enough	63.9	10.9	25.2
Quick tempered	85.6	6.1	8.3
Tells me where I stand	24.0	16.0	60.1
Annoying	85.6	4.2	10.2
Stubborn	79.2	5.4	15.3
Knows job well	8.9	10.9	80.2
Bad	90.4	5.4	4.2
Intelligent	5.1	8.0	86.9
Leaves me on my own	18.5	9.6	71.9
Around when needed	17.9	11.5	70.6
Lazy	94.6	4.2	1.3

* Y = if it describes the supervision you get on the job
N = if it does NOT describe it
? = if you cannot decide

Table 13 (continued)

Item N = 313	Percentage * N	 ?	 Y
Work on Present Job			
Fascinating	25.2	15.3	59.4
Routine	36.4	5.1	58.5
Satisfying	11.8	8.0	80.2
Boring	87.5	4.8	7.7
Good	5.1	8.3	86.6
Creative	10.2	9.3	80.5
Respected	18.8	13.1	68.1
Hot	47.3	29.7	23.0
Pleasant	9.6	9.9	80.5
Useful	3.2	6.1	90.7
Tiresome	36.4	7.3	56.2
Healthful	31.3	24.0	44.7
Challenging	6.4	4.5	89.1
On your feet	4.5	4.8	90.7
Frustrating	21.4	14.1	64.5
Simple	87.9	4.8	7.3
Endless	18.5	4.8	76.7
Gives sense of accomplishment	8.9	11.5	79.6

* Y = if it describes your work
N = if it does NOT describe it
? = if you cannot decide

Table 13 (continued)

Item N = 313	Percentage * N	 ?	 Y
People on Your Persent Job			
Stimulating	20.4	14.7	64.9
Boring	83.4	4.2	12.5
Slow	78.0	10.9	11.2
Ambitious	24.0	17.6	58.5
Stupid	94.2	3.8	1.9
Responsible	6.1	3.5	90.4
Fast	24.9	33.2	41.9
Intelligent	2.6	7.0	90.4
Easy to make enemies	75.7	10.5	13.7
Talk too much	62.9	12.1	24.9
Smart	6.1	14.1	79.9
Lazy	83.7	8.6	7.7
Unpleasant	86.3	9.3	4.5
No privacy	72.5	12.8	14.7
Active	9.6	8.6	81.8
Narrow interests	67.7	13.4	18.8
Loyal	13.7	16.6	69.6
Hard to meet	80.5	3.5	16.0

* Y = if it describes the people on the job
N = if it does NOT describe them
? = if you cannot decide

positive descriptors, in the sense that "no" towards negative descriptions indicates positive attitudes. Over 75% of the teachers in the study sample responded that eleven (of eighteen) characteristics were descriptive of people on their job. These characteristics included: not boring; not slow; not stupid; responsible; intelligent; not easy-to-make-enemies; smart; not lazy; not unpleasant; active; and not hard-to-meet.

Respondents seemed more positive, in terms of the descriptors which they rated, toward their supervision than either of the other characteristics. Next came people on the job, and, finally, the work itself. This trend can be seen by looking at the means and standard deviations presented in Table 14. The means for the eighteen work on your present job characteristics, in general, are lower than the means for the eighteen supervision characteristics or the people-on-the-job characteristics. Total descriptive characteristics means for each of the three areas also reflect a higher degree of job satisfaction with supervision and people variables than with the work itself (see Table 14).

Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations of Selected Study Variables (N=289)

	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Age	34.37	10.39
Race	1.30	.46
Mainstreamed Child(ren)?	1.53	.50
Role Change?	1.80	.40
Alienation	49.24	7.73
Role	66.30	7.18
Job Satisfaction - Total	121.38	25.02
Supervision	43.64	10.51
Work	34.79	9.83
People	42.95	11.29

Participation in Mainstreaming as Related to Selected Characteristics of the Study Sample

One variable which was considered a pivotal one in this study was concerned with whether or not individual respondents had ever had handicapped children mainstreamed into their classrooms. Prior to testing the hypotheses, therefore, investigations into the relationships that might exist with this mainstreaming variable were conducted. The results are given in Table 15.

As can be seen by looking at each contingency table and its resultant χ^2 values and levels of significance, the variables of sex of teacher, whether or not a respondent had ever had in-service training or schooling in mainstreaming, and choice of service which would help the most were irrelevant to teachers' having had children mainstreamed into their classroom. Significant differences were found, however, when looking at the race of the teacher respondent ($\chi^2 = 8.87$, $p < .003$), the most recent academic degree received by the teacher respondent ($\chi^2 = 4.71$, $p < .03$), and whether or not the teacher respondent had indicated a perceived change in role as a result of P.L. 94-142 ($\chi^2 = 4.06$, $p < .05$).

Black classroom teachers would be less likely to have had a child mainstreamed into their classroom than would White teachers according to these results. That is, there exists a significant difference in whether or not a teacher had ever had a mainstreamed child in his/her classroom depending on whether the teacher is White or Black; White teachers would be more likely candidates for a mainstreamed child. So, too, would teachers whose most recent degree received is the Master's. Master's degree candidates are more likely to have had a handicapped child mainstreamed into their classroom.

Table 15

Relationship of Selected Characteristics of Study Sample to Whether a Handicapped Child Has Been Mainstreamed into Classroom

Selected Characteristics		Have you ever had handicapped children mainstreamed into your classroom?			
		Percentage		X^2	P
		yes	no		
Sex	Male	4.5	4.2	.112	>.05
	Female	42.4	48.9		
Race	White	37.1	33.1	8.87 ($r=.18$, $p<.001$)	<.003*
	Black	9.9	19.9		
Recent Degree	Bachelor's	31.8	41.9	4.71 ($r=-.13$, $p<.02$)	<.03*
	Master's	15.3	11.0		
In-service in Mainstreaming	Yes	17.9	15.3	2.83	>.05
	No	28.8	38.0		
Role change as a result of P.L. 94-142.	Yes	11.5	8.0	4.06 ($r=.12$, $p<.02$)	<.05
	No	35.1	45.4		
Service which would help most	Psychologist	2.4	2.8	3.61	>.05
	Aide	18.1	25.3		
	Resource teacher	14.6	12.2		
	Consultant	4.2	4.2		
	In-Service	6.9	9.4		

Significant differences also exist among teachers between perceived role change and having had children mainstreamed into their classrooms. Teachers in the study sample who indicated that they have perceived a change in their role as a result of P.L. 94-142 are those who were more likely to have had a child mainstreamed into their classrooms. Most teachers however, neither perceived a change in role nor had had a handicapped child mainstreamed into their classroom (45.4%).

Tests of the Hypotheses

Both an hierarchical and a simultaneous MRC model were chosen for analytic purposes. The hierarchical model assumes no theoretical rationale for the order of entry of the variables into the regression equation. To some extent, though, the theoretical framework for this study, P and O theory (Argyris, 1957), specifies an entry order by the order in which the concepts P and O are presented; here, job satisfaction (P), then role (O) form that entry sequence. For this reason, a simultaneous model was used. An hierarchical model was also used, however, since the underlying basis or reason for using one approach or another was not strong.

Five MRC analyses were run, each corresponding to an hypothesis or sub-hypotheses, or to ancillary analyses. Thus, relationships among the three major study variables were obtained, as well as ancillary information.

A zero-order correlation matrix of selected study variables is presented in Table 16. All major study variables are included in this table (role, job satisfaction, and alienation), as are four study sample characteristics.

It can be seen that both role and job satisfaction (total and its parts) correlate significantly with alienation, the dependent variable. The _positive_ relationship between job satisfaction and alienation ($\underline{r} = .60$, $\underline{p} < .05$) is an artifact of the scoring of the alienation scale, however. In terms of being alienated, the higher a respondent's score on the _Alienation Scale_, the _less_ alienated the individual. Thus, the greater the degree of job satisfaction—total as well as the parts—the less the degree of work(er) alienation for respondents.

All selected study variables chosen for inclusion in this correlation matrix demonstrated significant relationships to alientation. Relative to

Table 16

Zero-Order Correlation Matrix of Selected Study Variables

							Job Satisfaction			
	Age	Race	Mainstreamed Children	Role Change	Alienation	Role	Total	Supervision	Work	People
Age	1.00	-.01	-.09	.12*	.17*	.08	.10	.01	.16*	.07
Race		1.00	.17*	.00	-.19*	-.03	-.06	-.02	.00	-.11*
Mainstreamed Children?			1.00	.12*	-.19*	.12*	-.07	-.01	-.18*	.01
Role Change?				1.00	.12*	.07	.11*	.08	.06	.12*
Alienation					1.00	-.22*	.60*	.47*	.51*	.45*
Role						1.00	-.25*	-.16*	-.30*	-.13*
Job Satisfaction										
Total							1.00	.80*	.77*	.80*
Supervision								1.00	.46*	.44*
Work									1.00	.42*
People										1.00

*$p < .05$

zero-order correlations between selected study characteristics/variables and the dependent variable, several findings emerged which warrant discussion:

1. The significant positive correlation between age and alienation ($r = .17$, $p < .05$) indicates that the older the respondent, the less likely that individual would be alienated from work or his/her fellow workers. Thus, the younger elementary school classroom teachers participating in this study are more alienated than their older counterparts.

2. The significant negative correlation between race and alienation ($r = .19$, $p < .05$) is an indication that the White elementary school classroom teachers who participated in this study are less likely to be alienated than his/her Black colleagues who participated.

3. The significant negative correlation between whether or not a teacher had a child mainstreamed into his/her classroom and alienation ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$) indicates that teachers who have had mainstreamed children in their rooms are less likely to be alienated than their colleagues who have not had such an experience.

4. The significant positive correlation of perceived change in role as a result of implementing P.L. 94-142 with alienation ($r = .12$, $p < .05$) is an indication that the more likely a respondent was to perceive no change in his/her role, the less alienated that individual appeared to be in this study.

In terms of their relationship with other variables in the study, or other study sample characteristics, the following significant correlations obtained:

1. The significant positive correlation of age with perceived change in role as a result of implementing P.L. 94-142 ($r = .12$, $p < .05$) indicates

that the older the responding teacher, the more likely he/she is to report no perceived role change. This seems to be consistent with the findings cited above that younger teachers are more alienated, and that perceiving a change in role as a result of P.L. 94-142 is associated with increased alienation from work.

2. The significant positive correlation of age with work-specific job satisfaction ($r = .16$, $p < .05$) demonstrates that older classroom teachers who responded are more likely to feel positive about their work than younger teachers who responded.

3. The significant positive correlation of race with whether or not a child had been mainstreamed into a respondent's class ($r = .17$, $p < .05$), indicates that Black teachers were less likely to have experienced a mainstreamed child than was a White teacher who responded.

4. The significant negative correlation between race and people-specific job satisfaction ($r = -.11$, $p < .05$) demonstrates that Black respondents were less job-satisfied about people they work with than White teachers.

5. The significant positive correlation between whether or not a teacher had experienced a mainstreamed child in his/her classroom and his/her perception of whether his/her role has changed ($r = .12$, $p < .05$) indicates that having had a child mainstreamed into his/her classroom is associated with perceiving a role change. It seems that if teachers have not had personal experiences with a mainstreamed child in their classrooms, they do not perceive their role has changed; if they've had a mainstreamed child, they're more likely to perceive a change in their role.

6. The significant positive correlation between whether or not a teacher had experienced a mainstreamed child in his/her classroom and his/her perception of his/her role ($r = .12$, $p < .05$) indicates that having had a

child mainstreamed into his/her classroom is associated with a more positive perception of his/her role in mainstreaming. It seems that the teachers who have experienced mainstreaming personally are more likely to perceive positively that part of their role concerning P.L. 94-142 than are their colleagues who have not had a mainstreamed child.

7. The significant negative correlation between having had a child mainstreamed into a classroom and work-specific job satisfaction ($r = -.18$, $p < .05$) indicates that having had the experience of a mainstreamed child is associated with a more positive description of one's work than if one had not had a child mainstreamed into his/her classroom.

8. The significant positive correlation between perceived role change and overall job satisfaction ($r = .11$, $p < .05$) and people-specific job satisfaction ($r = .12$, $p < .05$) indicates that the less likely a respondent was to indicate a perceived change in role as a result of implementing P.L. 94-142, the more likely that person is satisfied with his/her job in a general sense as well as a more people-on-the-job instance.

In studying the simple relationships between the dependent variable, alienation, and the independent variables, role and job satisfaction, three null hypotheses were tested. The results of the tests of these null hypotheses are presented below. In addition, the results of the test of the major null hypothesis, generated to guide the investigation of the interrelationships among role, job satisfaction, and alienation, are given below.

H_{o1}: There is no relationship between perceived role in implementing P.L. 94-142 and degree of alienation among classroom teachers.

Table 16 summarizes the relationships of these variables. The significant correlation between perceived role and degree of alienation ($r = -.22$,

$\underline{p} < .05$) indicates that the more positive a perceived role in implementing P.L. 94-142, the less the degree of alienation experienced by the respondent. This null hypothesis was rejected.

H_{o2}: There is no relationship between degree of job satisfaction and degree of alienation among classroom teachers.

In Table 16, the significant correlation between job satisfaction and alienation ($\underline{r} = .60$, $\underline{p} < .05$) is given. This indicates the degree of association between overall job satisfaction and alienation of the regular education classroom teachers who responded. Similar significant positive correlations of supervision-specific job satisfaction, work-specific job satisfaction, and people-specific job satisfaction exist ($\underline{r} = .47$, .51, and .45, respectively, $\underline{p} < .05$). Thus, the higher a teacher's job satisfaction, the less likely he/she is to be alienated from work or fellow workers. This null hypothesis was rejected.

H_{o3}: There is no relationship between perception of role in implementing P.L. 94-142 and degree of job satisfaction among classroom teachers.

The results of the test of this null hypothesis are given in Table 16. Significant negative correlations exist between perceived role and overall job satisfaction ($\underline{r} = -.25$, $\underline{p} < .05$), supervision-specific job satisfaction ($\underline{r} = -.16$, $\underline{p} < .05$), and people-specific job satisfaction ($\underline{r} = -.13$, $\underline{p} < .05$). Thus, the more positive a teacher's perception of his/her role in mainstreaming, the greater his/her degree of job satisfaction in an overall as well as specific sense. This null hypothesis was rejected.

The significant correlations found as a result of testing null hypothesis three have impact on the test of the major null hypothesis. Possible problems with multicollinearity, the lack of independence between independent variables in a regression model, were brought to the surface. However, the correlations are not high; they are significant but should not interfere with the outcome prediction in the MRC analysis.

The test of the major null hypothesis involved the regression of alienation on perceived role in implementing P.L. 94-142 and job satisfaction. The major null hypothesis stated:

H_o: There is no relationship of perceived role in implementing P.L. 94-142 and job satisfaction to alienation among regular education classroom teachers.

Results of the analyses are presented in Tables 17, 18 and 19. In Table 17, a summary of the application of the simultaneous MRC model to test the null is given. As can be seen, the independent variables do explain a significant amount of variability in the dependent variable ($R^2 = .37$, $p < .05$). Thus, approximately 37% of the variance in alienation could be explained by job satisfaction and role. The unique contribution of both variables found by testing the semi-partial correlations is significant ($F = 162.53$, $p < .05$ for job satisfaction and $F = 83.12$, $p < .05$ for role) although the magnitude of the contributions differs considerably as can be observed by noting the Beta weights and R^2 for each variable.

Figures in Table 18 represent the results of the application of a hierarchical MRC model. The entry order of (1) role and (2) job satisfaction makes a difference as to the magnitude of the variability accounted for in the dependent variable by both of the independent variables. Using a hierarchical model because of the theoretically-specified sequencing of the independent variables, permits the perceived role variable to contribute at a greater level. The unique contributions of both variables found by testing the semi-partial correlations is significant ($F = 15.09$, $p < .05$ for role and $F = 83.12$, $p < .05$ for job satisfaction). The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 17

Results of the Stepwise Regression of Alienation on Job Satisfaction (Total) and Role (N=289)

Variable	b	Beta	R	R^2	R^2 Change	F
Job Satisfaction (Total)	.18	.58	.60	.36	.36	162.53*
Role	-.86	-.08	.61	.37	.01	83.12*
(Constant)	33.16					

*$p < .05$

Table 18

Results of the Regression of Alienation on Job Satisfaction (Total) and Role (N=289)

Variable	b	Beta	R	R^2	R^2 Change	F
Role	.86	-.08	.22	.05	.05	15.09*
Job Satisfaction (Total)	.18	.58	.61	.37	.32	83.12*
(Constant)	33.16					

*p < .05

Table 19

Results of the Regression of Alienation on Job Satisfaction Work, Supervision, and People and Role (N=289)

Variable	b	Beta	R	R^2	R^2 Change	F
Role	-.74	-.07	.22	.05		15.09*
Work	.15	.22	.48	.23	.18	
Supervision	.17	.23	.56	.31	.08	41.92*
People	.23	.29	.61	.37	.06	
(Constant)	32.39					

*$p < .05$

One further analysis was conducted relative to the three major study variables and the interrelationships among them. Table 19 shows the hierarchical model regression of alienation on perceived role and the job satisfaction variable set-work, supervision, and people. Within the variable set, a simultaneous approach was used, with work-specific job satisfaction accounting for the greatest amount of variance in the dependent variable of any members of the set. Next came supervision-specific job satisfaction, and, finally, people-specific job satisfaction. All four variables contributed significantly to account for variance in the dependent variable.

To understand further the relation of various factors to regular education classroom teachers' alienation, additional analyses were performed. Tables 20 and 21 give the results of regression analyses using the major study variables and selected study sample characteristics as predictors. With the addition of the four study sample characteristics, an additional 5% of the variance in the dependent variable, alienation, was accounted for by the independent variables; 42% of the variability of alienation can be explained by a person's overall job satisfaction, race, age, perceived role in implementing P.L. 94-142, perceived change in role, and whether they have experienced a mainstreamed child in their classroom.

All variables contributed significantly. The four study sample characteristics contributed, whether taken as a set or individually (see Tables 20 and 21). Thus, of the 42% of the variance accounted for in alienation of teachers, 59% is accounted for by their perceived role in implementing P.L. 94-142, 3% is accounted for by age and race separately, 2% is accounted for by whether or not they perceive their role has changed, 1% is accounted for by whether or not they have had children mainstreamed

Table 20

Results of the Stepwise Regression of Alienation on Job Satisfaction (Total), Role, and Selected Study Sample Characteristics (N=289)

Variable	b	Beta	R	R^2	R^2 Change	F
Job Satisfaction (Total)	.17	.54	.60	.36		162.53*
Race	-2.39	-.14	.62	.39	.024	89.81*
Mainstreamed Child(ren)?	-1.68	-.11	.63	.40	.014	63.28*
Age	.08	.11	.64	.41	.011	49.40*
Role	-.10	-.09	.65	.42	.007	40.57*
Role Change?	1.23	.06	.65	.42	.004	34.23*
(Constant)	36.24					

*p < .05

Table 21

Results of the Regression of Alienation on Selected Study Sample Characteristics, Role, and Job Satisfaction (N=289)

Variable	b	Beta	R	R^2	R^2 Change	F
Age	.79	.11	.17	.03	.03	
Race	-2.39	-.14	.26	.07	.03	7.74*
Mainstreamed Child(ren)?	-1.68	.06	.27	.07	.01	
Role Change?	1.23	-.11	.31	.10	.02	
Role	-.10	-.09	.39	.15	.05	10.18*
Job Satisfaction	.17	.54	.65	.42	.27	34.23*
(Constant)	36.24					

$^*p < .05$

into their classroom, and 27% is accounted for by their degree of overall job satisfaction.

Five - Summary, Implications and Conclusions

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of perceived role of regular education classroom teachers in implementing P.L. 94-142 and their perceived job satisfaction to their degree of work(er) alienation. In addition to these main study variables, selected characteristics of the study sample, such as age and race, were used to investigate further areas which might help account for the alienation of regular education classroom teachers in implementing P.L. 94-142.

A transaction-based theoretical framework, personality and organization theory (Argyris, 1957), was used to guide the study. Through this framework one looks at both personal and organizational characteristics to define how people develop and what they develop as coping strategies for their frustration working in an organization. Here, alienation was used as the coping strategy developed by regular education classroom teachers as a result of the transaction between their role in implementing the special education mandate, P.L. 94-142, and their job satisfaction.

Literature and research reviews were conducted in the areas of alienation, role, and job satisfaction to provide support beyond that of the theoretical framework for study. As a result of such searching, methodological decisions were made to conduct a field survey of regular education classroom teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Over three hundred teachers returned useable questionnaires out of the approximately one thousand teachers who agreed to participate initially. The questionnaire which they completed consisted of four sections. The first section asked teachers to respond about such characteristics as age, sex, race, degree of formal schooling and in-service training (general and specific-to-mainstreaming), whether or not they had had a child mainstreamed into their class, and whether or not they perceived their role as having changed as a result of P.L. 94-142. The second section had teachers indicate their perceptions of their role in mainstreaming relative to preparation, decision-making input, and opinions of the mainstreamed child. Third, teachers indicated their degree of alienation to work or their fellow workers on the Alienation Scale (Adams, 1969). The last section of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate, from a set of eighteen descriptors, the factors which describe their job relative to supervision, the work itself, and people. This last section assessed their job satisfaction through an adaptation of the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendal, & Hulen, 1969).

Null hypotheses were generated, and the data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and through a multiple regression/correlation (MRC) analyses. In addition to examining the relationship among the major study variables through the hypotheses, additional analyses were used to assess the influence of selected study sample characteristics on their alienation.

A "composite" picture of a respondent to this study would show a female elementary regular education classroom teacher. She would be 26 years old, White, and would have had 5 years of teaching experience. This "composite" teacher would most recently have completed a bachelor's degree in an education-related area, but would not be working on another degree. She would have had little formal schooling or training in mainstreaming, but, if any, would have had one course (three credit hours) regarded as in-service training, which she would consider useful. For the most part, though, she would have taken the training because she wanted to have it. This teacher probably would not have had a child mainstreamed into her class as yet, and thus would not feel as if her role as a classroom teacher had changed. But, if she had to choose one service which would help her implement the mainstreaming mandate, she would rather have an aide than a resource teacher, in-service training, consultant, or psychologist.

Relative to their role in implementing P.L. 94-142, around half of the teachers indicated that: (1) they had not been told what responsibilities they had in the mainstreaming process, and (2) they had not had adequate input into the process or program. Almost all respondents indicated that money would not be better spent on gifted and talented students rather than handicapped ones, and all the money necessary to educate handicapped students should be spent. Responses elicited from teachers also showed them to have positive feelings about themselves in the mainstreaming process, and their role and capabilities in teaching a mainstreamed child as well as any of their regular education colleagues.

In terms of alienation, the strongest indicators were those which focus on schools as imperfect organizations. Teachers feel that they don't have meaningful input into decisions that are made in their schools in spite of serving on major committees, and that they cannot get policies changed in the school. Additionally, more than one-third of the respondents perceived that their colleagues feel lonely.

Relative to job satisfaction, grouped responses showed overall job satisfaction to be relatively high. Teachers described the supervision on their job most positively, then the people on their job. Most respondents indicated they felt the work itself, however, to be much less positive a part of their job satisfaction than the other factors.

Black regular education classroom teachers would be less likely to have had a child mainstreamed into their classroom than their White counterparts. Similarly, teachers whose most recent degree is the Master's and those who perceive a change in the role would be more likely to have had a child mainstreamed into their class than would their counterparts.

The major null hypothesis and all three minor null hypotheses were rejected. Over 35% of the variance in the alienation of regular education classroom teachers was accounted for by their job satisfaction and perceived role in implementing P.L. 94-142. In addition, selected study sample characteristics such as age, race, having had a child mainstreamed into their classroom, and perceiving a change in their role as a result of P.L. 94-142 added another 7% of variance to be accounted for in alienation. Several other findings also emerged:

1. the older the teacher, the more likely he/she is to perceive a change in role as a result of P.L. 94-142;

2. the older the teacher, the more positive his/her work-specific job satisfaction;

3. Black teachers indicated less people-specific job satisfaction than their White counterparts;

4. teachers who have had children mainstreamed into their classroom are more likely to perceive the role in implementing P.L. 94-142 positively than are their counterparts;

5. teachers who have had children mainstreamed into their classroom are more likely to describe their work-specific job satisfaction positively than are their counterparts; and

6. teachers who perceive their role has changed as a result of P.L. 94-142 are more likely to describe their overall job satisfaction and people-specific job satisfaction positively than are their counterparts.

Implications of the Study

While their importance to the success of mainstreaming is evident, many classroom teachers have become mainstreaming "casualties". A lack of preplanning and training, little attention given to negative teacher attitudes, careless inventories of the necessary teaching competencies, and equivocal evidence regarding alternative mainstreaming models have all contributed to the problems being experienced today (Cruickshank, 1974; Gickling, Murphy, & Mallory, 1979; and Gickling and Theobald, 1975).

In particular, several points should be considered in the attempts to understand "teacher-related" mainstreaming problems and their implications for in-service:

1. The majority of regular educators receive no special education training during their pre-service degree program in teaching. In addition, many are involved in mainstreaming prior to receiving even in-service training.
2. Teachers who sought a degree in regular education made a conscious decision not to teach handicapped children.
3. There is a wide range of attitudes among teachers regarding the appropriateness and feasibility of mainstreaming handicapped children.
4. Teachers often feel overwhelmed by large class sizes, variances among children within a classroom, and time-consuming management and administrative procedures. The addition of one or two handicapped children to the class without appropriate support services or other compensation has not been welcomed by everyone.

5. The emphasis upon academic skills epitomized by the "back to basics" movement and minimum competency exams has increased the pressure on educators to teach all children successfully.
6. Teachers working with mainstreamed children may experience feelings of isolation when they confront daily instructional problems alone.
7. The procedures outlined in P.L. 94-142 (assessment, eligibility procedures, Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), and due process) are not familiar to all teachers and often have resulted in confusion and limited success.

These considerations are relevant to the training and support service needs of teachers working with mainstreamed children. A teacher who is affected by any of the areas may become dissatisfied with the teaching role, then alienated, and finally "burned-out" from the educational system. Teachers do, however, express a willingness to work with handicapped children in their classes if they are given the necessary training and support.

Rude (1978) has listed the national training need priorities as specified in state plans submitted under P.L. 94-142. They are as follows:

Rank Order	Topics
1	Instructional procedures/classroom management
2	Curriculum/programming/materials/resources
3	Individualized education program
4	Identify, locate, refer handicapped children
5	Child evaluation procedures
6	Least restrictive environment

Rank Order	Topics
7	Implementing Public Law 94-142
8	Communication
9	Coordination of services

Through a detailed needs assessment of teachers in Tennessee, Gickling et al. (1979) found that the first in-service priority of both regular classroom teachers and special educators was the demonstration of individualized teaching methods. This study further reinforces the priorities emphasized by Rude (1978) and confirms the need for practical training and support systems. This emphasis upon individualization and practical assistance is verified in the present research study. Teachers overwhelmingly expressed a need for additional support through utilization of teacher aides and resource services.

The low priority given to in-service training programs by the participants in this study may be the result of several factors. First, poor in-service may have been offered in the past. In-service programs which are designed and executed without consideration of audience needs and existing skills are wasteful and may actually deter teaching improvement. Respondents indicated a lack of input in this area. However, if in-service programs are based upon an accurate needs assessment and if they offer utilitarian methods and materials concerning the education of handicapped children, they may be perceived more positively. Second, in-service delivery to the total population may be limited. A majority (66%) of the study sample have not received formal schooling or in-service training pertaining to mainstreaming. This group has been influenced by the mainstreaming movement, whether or not they have been working directly with a mainstreamed child. School resources have been reallocated, procedures changed, and policies established according to the mandates of P.L. 94-142. It is possible that in-service is perceived by this group of teachers as too removed from their present needs. Finally in-service is generally perceived as a short-term external training strategy. The historical design of in-service programs has been as a group training procedure lasting from one hour to one or two days. Training takes place outside the classroom through lecture,discussion, or simulation activities which may not provide the extended, practical assistance that teachers need.

The results of the present study suggest that teacher educators and administrators may need to seek new directions for support systems and in-service training. Within the guidelines of P.L. 94-142 in-service is defined as "any training other than that received by an individual in a full time program which leads to a degree" (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1979, p. 59).

It is possible to modify the in-service delivery system and still remain within the structure of this definition. Alternative suggestions for in-service designs include:

1. teachers themselves act as trainers to develop and conduct in-service for their schools;
2. in-class demonstration of teaching programs by other teachers or instructional experts;
3. creation of teacher training teams in which each member is responsible for gathering and disseminating instructional information to the other team members;
4. use of video taping procedures to provide teachers with direct feedback concerning their instructional skills; and
5. development of in-service topics which reflect expressed teacher concerns such as, "how to derive the greatest benefit

from a paraprofessional aide in the classroom", "appropriate use of school resources", "effective scheduling procedures", and "a team approach to special and regular education."

It is apparent that regular classroom teachers are being asked to assume additional responsibilities within mainstreaming programs. Although only 22% of the teachers surveyed cited specific role changes, it is likely that many more teachers have quietly accepted these new responsibilities and roles. It is equally possible that many of the study sample teachers have received teacher education since the introduction of mainstreaming and have always expected to teach some handicapped children.

The continuous training of classroom teachers is an important component of the educational program. Without "skill updating," education would become stagnant and teachers mere technicians. What this research and other studies before it seem to indicate is that in-service training needs to become more responsive to teacher needs, more practical in orientation, and more integral to the everyday teaching process rather than external to the reality of the classroom. The onus of responsibility for revitalizing in-service programs for mainstreaming now rests with teacher educators, administrators, and the teachers themselves.

A Look to the Future

This study was about regular education elementary teachers' perceptions of their job satisfaction, work(er) alienation, and role in implementing the special education mandate P. L. 94-142. The study team found that elementary teachers are alienated, and that part of that alienation can be attributed to their perceptions of their role in implementing mainstreaming. Regular educators perceive that they lack input into decision-making activities, training or schooling which would have prepared them for the implementation of the mandate, and congruity between their need for autonomy and their need for fulfilling responsibilities they know nothing about relative to P. L. 94-142.

When asked to give an example of one way in which their role had changed as a result of P. L. 94-142, some teachers responded:

> "I need more time--the time passes by so quickly,"
>
> "It has caused me to feel less qualified,"
>
> "Pressure,"
>
> "Not trained to deal with such a range of problems," and
>
> "Along with all the typical problems and frustrations of teaching, a lot more effort, understanding and patience is needed to deal with a mainstreamed child in my classroom."

Those teachers who perceived a change in their role were largely those who had experienced a mainstreamed child in the classroom. Furthermore, having had a mainstreamed child in the classroom was associated with a more positive perception by the teachers of their role in implementing P. L. 94-142.

Does this mean that school boards and their staffs should consider mainstreaming a child into every classroom in order to assure positive perceptions of their teachers' role in mainstreaming? No! As a correlational descriptive study, no such causal inferences should be made from the data in the first place. Second, one of the very complaints that teachers seem to be voicing through this study is that mainstreaming, as a mandate, was initiated too quickly. Without clear responsibilities for the role outlined, vehicles set up for allowing input and feedback into the system, and training or schooling to prepare them for the role, teachers have become disgusted, frustrated, and pressured. And the last thing they need is a "quick and dirty" solution as a result of little-substantiated linkages from these data.

In terms of their job satisfaction, teachers describe their supervision and their colleagues more positively than their work. It is also the teachers' job satisfaction (or lack of it) which is more largely associated with alienation than is their perceived role in implementing the mandate. Instrumentation may be responsible for some of the discrepancy in the contributions of the two variables; the job satisfaction section of the questionnaire was more reliable, valid, and fully developed than the role section. These differences, alone, could account for a large measure of the variation.

As with the positive perceptions of their role, teachers are more job satisfied if they have had a child mainstreamed into their classroom than if they have not had. Again, should we mainstream a child into every classroom so that teachers can becomes more satisfied? No. We need to decrease the rapidity with which we implement quick solutions, on the one hand, yet increase the delivery of appropriate support services for teachers on the other hand.

Teachers, when they enter the "profession," may not be fully aware of the responsibilities, obligations, and duties of working in organizations like schools (Corwin & Edelfelt, 1977). Preparatory programs are too short to be able to expose the potential teacher to all the aspects, overt and hidden, of being an educator, or to give them all the skills necessary. So teachers may feel overwhelmed for much of their professional lives by the mandates that need fulfilling, the paperwork that needs pushing, and the non-curricular, non-instructional trivia with which they must deal.

The first stage in coping with the "world of classroom teaching" may be wide-eyed excitement and idealism. Next, the challenge of dealing with the complexities of the classroom and school may help teachers cope with the work. Third, teachers may reach a "neutral" point of acceptance. Here, they neither love nor hate their job in a general sense, but have come to understand the factors, both hindering and facilitative, with which they must deal, and can be comfortable with what they are doing in the classroom. Fourth, teachers may become resigned to their work, evidencing little interest, enthusiasm, or esprit de corps, or they may rebel or become alienated, the fifth stage in this coping process. As an adaptive mechanism for dealing with the frustrations of school organizational life, alienation, upon which this study focused, can be identified by feelings of withdrawal, isolation, normlessness, and powerlessness. At this point, teachers may transfer their need fulfillment to a source external to the school, classroom, or student. This fifth stage of alienation may be the last. It may be that a sixth stage, "burnout," becomes a coping mechanism developed by teachers to survive the exigencies of schools; or "burnout" may be a function of teachers' inabilities to develop coping strategies or adaptive mechanisms.

Burnout is the "syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that frequently occurs among individuals who do peoplework" (Maslach & Jackson, 1979). Symptoms of burnout include "mental fatigue, anxiety, depression, anger, [and] even physical ailments" (Reed, 1979, p. 12). As Seeman (1959) noted in Section Two, the variables of control and withdrawal affected to some degree an individual's alienation. It may be a matter of the degree to which an individual feels out of control relative to his/her environment and, therefore, the degree to which he/she withdraws that determines whether or not the individual is alienated or burned-out.

Although this study focused on teacher alienation as a function of perceived role and job satisfaction, not all factors which lead to increased alienation in teachers were accounted for--less than half, according to the instrumentation and analyses. Therefore other things are producing alienation in teachers. What those factors are remains an area open for further research. Additionally, the linkages between alienation and burnout as coping strategies need to be investigated further. Although there appears to be some "developmental" progression in the coping mechanisms that teachers exhibit, more research is needed to define them and operationalize them and to establish both preventive and remedial programs which can forestall symptoms of burnout. What makes some people use some coping mechanisms and not others? Is there some linear combination of mechanisms which is predictive of burnout?

At what points do teachers use certain coping mechanisms and not others? What relationships exist between teacher burnout and school climate? These are just some of the questions which can serve to guide future research.

Appendix A

Schools That Agreed to Participate in the Survey

* Willis Elementary
* Pulaski High School
* Boonsboro Elementary School
* Thomas Jefferson Middle School
Madison Heights Elementary
* Suffolk High School
* Wise Middle School
Rockbridge High School
* Goochland Elementary School
* Florence Bowser Primary
* Smithfield Elementary School
* Ashburn Elementary School
Parry McCluer High School
* Bedford Elementary School
David A. Dutrow Elementary School
* Ladysmith Elementary
* Linkhorne Elementary
* Scottsville Elementary School
J.R. Tucker High School
Potomac Elementary
* Tomahawk School
* Westmoreland Middle School
* Columbia District Elementary
* Alanton Elementary
* Martinsville High School
* Larchmont Elementary School
Speedwell Elementary
* Groveton Elementary
* Goshen Elementary School
* Spotsylvania High School
* Fancy Gap Elementary
* Ratcliffe School
* Madison Primary
* Walnut Hill School
Central High School
* Botetourt Elementary
* Stuarts Draft Elementary School
* Temperance Elementary School

* schools that actually returned completed questionnaires

Appendix B

Ways in Which Classroom Teachers' Role Has Changed as a Result of P.L. 94-142

- providing experiences which include "specials"
- more time devoted to helping that child
- my lesson plans have to be adapted to each child
- I develop and implement the IEPs of each child
- a wider variety of students
- teacher is legally responsible for his success or failure despite training or time
- I need more time -- the time passes by so quickly
- added responsibility toward just one student that may take time from others
- special skills called upon; demanding schedule
- teaching units and testing on their level
- you must provide special instruction and care
- too much attention given to handicapped child at the expense of others
- more accountability
- adjust strategies to meet needs of child
- special physical arrangement of room
- identifying LD
- classroom management
- it would be good for other children in the class to learn responsibility for others
- dealing with severely physically handicapped

Appendix B (continued)

- teaching a child without proper training
- paperwork
- more discipline responsibility
- often have to change class schedules when another child is mainstreamed, because of conflicting times!
- we are now expected to be specialists in all areas
- we are expected to be specialists in all areas
- possibility of not being aware of strategies needed to help handicapped children
- it has caused me to feel less qualified
- not trained to deal with such a range of problems
- student requires so much individual attention that the rest of the class suffers from lack of attention from me!
- possible suit
- not enough time to devote to the handicapped as well as all my other students
- pressure
- more requirements and responsibility
- additional time needed to individualize the IEP
- along with all the typical problems and frustrations of teaching, a lot more effort, understanding and patience is needed to deal with a mainstreamed child in my classroom
- takes lots of time (away from other students) to do the necessary one to one instruction
- limits movement activities and makes lessons more repetitive
- you can better plan lessons better for those individual students

Appendix B (continued)

- for the most part, they are getting twice as much individual help / teachers consult work together
- I tend to give more attention to the special child, sometimes neglecting the others
- my special education kids have been mainstreamed out of my class
- to adjust to the students better
- more understanding and help needed
- I am not as nervous about having the children in my class
- not as apprehensive about having mainstreamed children
- lack of grade level material for these students
- my responsibility to the handicapped child is the same as to any other child
- before I thought the responsibility was solely the special education teacher's

Appendix C

Dear Teacher:

In cooperation with Phi Delta Kappa (University of Virginia Chapter), the Bureau of Educational Research is conducting a study to investigate regular classroom teachers' perceptions of their role in implementing the mainstreaming objectives of P.L. 94-142, and their feelings of alienation and job satisfaction. You are one of a group of teachers who has been asked to participate. We would like you to answer each question as honestly and completely as possible. Your responses will remain anonymous, no identifying answers are requested. Your earliest response would be most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Terry Ann Schwartz
Bureau of Educational Research
Phi Delta Kappa
(University of Virginia Chapter)

Section I

Directions: Please answer each question as completely as possible by filling in the blanks or circling the appropriate responses.

1. Age ______ 2. Sex ______ 3. Race ______

4. Total years teaching experience ______

5. I received my most recent academic degree________________ (B.A., M.A., etc.), in_____________ (subject area),

and have_______ (number) credit hours toward my________________________ (M.A., Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.) degree in

_____________ (subject area).

6. Have you had formal training/schooling in teaching the mainstreamed child? (e.g., in-service education, degree-credit education)

Yes No

If yes, where? (list most recent) ____

how many courses? ________________________ credit hours? ____________

how useful has the most recent training been?

very useful useful not useful

why did you undertake such training?

handicapped child in family

required by school division

wanted to

other reasons

7. Have you ever had handicapped children mainstreamed into your classroom?

Yes No

8. Do you feel your role as a classroom teacher has been noticeably changed due to the implementation of P.L. 94-142?

Yes No

If yes, in what way? List one way only.

____

9. What is the grade organization of your school (e.g., K-5, K-6, 9-12)? ________

10. Given limited resources, which of the following services would help you the most in teaching mainstreamed children? (Circle only one service.)

psychologist aide resource teacher consultant

an in-service program or series of programs

Section II

Directions: In this section are statements regarding a classroom teacher's role in implementing the mainstreaming objectives of P.L. 94-142. Please indicate your perceptions about each item by circling your responses according to the rating scale; i.e., to what extent each item is true or untrue (or to what extent each item would be true or untrue if you were to be involved in implementing P.L. 94-142).

Rating scale:

1. Yes, I strongly believe that it is true or that it would be true.
2. Yes, I believe that it is somewhat true or that it would be somewhat true.
3. No, I believe that it is somewhat untrue or that it would be somewhat untrue.
4. No, I strongly believe that it is untrue or that it would be untrue.

1. As a classroom teacher, I have been told exactly what my responsibilities are in the process of implementing P.L. 94-142. 1 2 3 4

2. The special education specialist is in charge of the mainstreamed child's advancement; as a classroom teacher, I do what he(she) tells me. 1 2 3 4

3. As a classroom teacher, I have not had adequate input into the mainstreaming process in my school. 1 2 3 4

4. My needs as a classroom teacher should set the framework for my school's in-service programs relative to mainstreaming. 1 2 3 4

5. As a classroom teacher, I have been told that I am obligated to fulfill the Individual Education Programs (IEPs). 1 2 3 4

6. As a classroom teacher, I should be given paid time off to undergo training necessary to teach children mainstreamed into my classroom. 1 2 3 4

7. As a classroom teacher, I cannot fully minister to the mainstreamed child in a class of 30 youngsters, all of whom need attention. 1 2 3 4

8. As a classroom teacher, I should tell the special education resource teachers what to include in in-service programs in mainstreaming. 1 2 3 4

9. As a classroom teacher, I feel that specialists are now developing in-service programs in mainstreaming with little or no concern for the teachers who must put them into practice. 1 2 3 4

10. As a classroom teacher, I can only deal with a limited number of children who are to be mainstreamed into my classroom. 1 2 3 4

11. As a classroom teacher, I feel that the money spent to educate handicapped children would be better spent on educating gifted and talented children. 1 2 3 4

12. As a classroom teacher, my consent should be necessary before a handicapped child is placed in my classroom for mainstreaming purposes. 1 2 3 4

13. As a classroom teacher, I want in-service sessions in mainstreaming to be carried out after school. 1 2 3 4

14. As a classroom teacher, I feel that I am more apt to reject the mainstreamed child than will his classmates. 1 2 3 4

15. As a classroom teacher, I feel that in-service programs are of little value in helping me deal with mainstreamed children. 1 2 3 4

16. As a classroom teacher, I feel that I am able to focus upon the mainstreamed child's capabilities, not his "label." 1 2 3 4

17. As a classroom teacher, I have not had adequate input into the assignment(s) of (a) mainstreamed child(ren) into my classroom. 1 2 3 4

18. As a classroom teacher, I feel that I can teach the mainstreamed child as well or better than a special education teacher. 1 2 3 4

19. As a classroom teacher, I feel that the NEA, AFT, or some other organization must act in order to insure adequate teacher input into the mainstreaming process. 1 2 3 4

20. As a classroom teacher, I have the skills to teach mainstreamed children in my classroom. 1 2 3 4

21. As a classroom teacher, I believe that mainstreaming will succeed in integrating "normal" and "special" children in all areas of schooling. 1 2 3 4

22. As a classroom teacher, I have a positive perception of myself and my role in the process of mainstreaming. 1 2 3 4

23. As a classroom teacher, I believe that the process of mainstreaming will cause much discontent among other classroom teachers. 1 2 3 4

24. As a classroom teacher, I believe that "special" children were receiving adequate instruction before P.L. 94-142. 1 2 3 4

25. As a classroom teacher, I believe that we should spend all that is necessary to properly educate children with special needs. 1 2 3 4

26. As a result of in-service training, I feel that I have become more capable of managing the mainstreamed student in the regular classroom. 1 2 3 4

27. As a classroom teacher, I can teach a mainstreamed child as well as any other classroom teacher. 1 2 3 4

28. As a classroom teacher, I have not had adequate input into the development and process of mainstreaming programs. 1 2 3 4

29. As a classroom teacher, I do not have the skills necessary to eliminate the classroom management problems which result from mainstreaming. 1 2 3 4

30. As a classroom teacher, I believe that paid in-service training should be given after school in the area of mainstreaming. 1 2 3 4

Section III

Directions: In this section are some statements regarding school systems and issues in general. Please indicate your opinion about these items, i.e., whether you agree or disagree with the items as they stand. Please circle the numeral that represents your opinion as a classroom teacher about each item.

Rating scale:
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

31. Sometimes I feel all alone in the school. 1 2 3 4

32. I worry about the future facing today's youth. 1 2 3 4

33. A teacher such as myself usually can find ways to get systematic policies changed if he(she) feels strongly about them. 1 2 3 4

34. Most teachers in this school seldom feel lonely. 1 2 3 4

35. Sometimes I have the feeling that the principal and other teachers are using me. 1 2 3 4

36. Teachers here feel they have little say about important systemwide policies relating to teaching. 1 2 3 4

37. A teacher such as myself feels he(she) does not know what is going on in the upper levels of administration. 1 2 3 4

38. Real friends are as easy as ever to find. 1 2 3 4

39. It is frightening to be responsible for the development of a teenager. 1 2 3 4

40. A teacher such as myself never has a chance to work on school committees which make important decisions for the school system. 1 2 3 4

41. There are so many decisions that have to be made today that sometimes I could just "blow up." 1 2 3 4

42. One can always find friends if he(she) himself(herself) has a friendly manner. 1 2 3 4

43. There are few dependable ties between teachers anymore. 1 2 3 4

44. The world in which we live is basically a friendly place. 1 2 3 4

45. There is little chance for promotion in this school system unless a person gets a "break." 1 2 3 4

46. We are so regimented today that there is not much room for choice even in personal matters. 1 2 3 4

47. Teachers are just naturally friendly and helpful. 1 2 3 4

48. The future looks very dismal. 1 2 3 4

49. I do not get to visit other teachers as often as I would really like. 1 2 3 4

50. As a classroom teacher, think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision? In the blank beside each word, put

Y if it describes the supervision you get on your job

N if it does NOT describe it

? if you cannot decide

SUPERVISION ON PRESENT JOB

____ Asks my advice
____ Hard to please
____ Impolite
____ Praises good work
____ Tactful
____ Influential
____ Up-to-date
____ Doesn't supervise enough
____ Quick tempered
____ Tells me where I stand
____ Annoying
____ Stubborn
____ Knows job well
____ Bad
____ Intelligent
____ Leaves me on my own
____ Around when needed
____ Lazy

51. As a classroom teacher, think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word given below, write

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work

N for "No" if it does NOT describe it

? if you cannot decide

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

____ Fascinating
____ Routine
____ Satisfying
____ Boring
____ Good
____ Creative
____ Respected
____ Hot
____ Pleasant
____ Useful
____ Tiresome
____ Healthful
____ Challenging
____ On your feet
____ Frustrating
____ Simple
____ Endless
____ Gives sense of accomplishment

52. As a classroom teacher, think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words describe these people? In the blank beside each word, put

Y if it describes the people you work with

N if it does NOT describe them

? if you cannot decide

PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB

____ Stimulating
____ Boring
____ Slow
____ Ambitious
____ Stupid
____ Responsible
____ Fast
____ Intelligent
____ Easy to make enemies
____ Talk too much
____ Smart
____ Lazy
____ Unpleasant
____ No privacy
____ Active
____ Narrow interests
____ Loyal
____ Hard to meet

---

*Adapted from Job Descriptive Index (JDI); Bowling Green State University, 1975.

Appendix D

Item Responses to Selected Characteristics Section of Questionnaire

1. AGE

AGE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
22-25	46	15.5
26-27	45	15.2
28-30	55	18.6
31-34	42	14.1
35-40	38	12.9
41-49	34	11.6
50-59	28	9.5
60 and over	8	2.6

2. SEX

SEX	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Male	27	8.7
Female	282	91.3

3. RACE

RACE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
White	212	70.2
Black	90	29.8

4. YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE

YEARS	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1-2	36	11.7
3-4	51	16.6
5	31	10.1
6-7	36	11.7
8-10	45	14.6
11-13	41	13.4
14-20	41	13.4
21-30	20	6.6
31 and over	7	2.0

Appendix D (continued)

5. MOST RECENT DEGREE

DEGREE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Bachelor's	227	73.7
Master's	81	26.3

6. SUBJECT AREA

AREA	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Education-related	272	89.8
Academic	31	10.2

7. CREDIT HOURS TOWARD NEXT DEGREE

CREDIT HOURS	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1-3	15	12.0
4-6	32	25.6
7-9	18	14.4
10-12	12	9.6
13-15	9	7.2
16-18	11	8.8
19 and over	28	21.6

DEGREE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Master's	103	92.0
Doctorate	9	8.0

8. FORMAL SCHOOLING IN MAINSTREAMING

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
yes	104	33.9
no	203	66.1

Appendix D (continued)

9. HOW MANY COURSES

COURSES	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	60	80.0
2	10	13.3
3 or more	5	6.7

10. USEFULNESS OF COURSES

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
very useful	15	15.3
useful	72	73.5
not useful	11	11.2

11. REASON FOR TAKING COURSES

REASON	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
handicapped child in family	2	1.9
required	43	41.3
wanted to	49	47.1
other	10	9.6

12. MAINSTREAMED CHILD IN CLASS?

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
yes	146	47.6
no	161	52.4

Appendix D (continued)

13. ROLE CHANGE AS CLASSROOM TEACHER?

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
yes	61	22.0
no	216	78.0

14. SERVICE MOST HELPFUL FOR P.L. 94-142

SERVICE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
psychologist	15	5.2
aide	125	43.4
resource teacher	77	26.7
consultant	24	8.3
in-service program	47	16.3

Appendix E

May 16, 1979

As a member of and former advisor to Phi Delta Kappa (University of Virginia Chapter), I have been asked to furnish names of principals who would be willing to cooperate in a PDK research study involving classroom teachers. I realize that the school year is almost over and that both you and your staff are busy, but--as the old adage goes--if you need something done, ask the busy people.

The study involves surveying regular classroom teachers about their perceptions of some factors which may impact the mainstreaming process. As we all know, mainstreaming has brought to the forefront issues and concerns of teachers. Through this survey, teachers will be able to explore some of their feelings relative to mainstreaming. The information will be helpful in making future plans for in-service education.

We estimate that it will take each teacher approximately 20 minutes to complete the instrument; a copy of the instrument is enclosed for your preview. If you feel most of your classroom teachers would participate in this study, we shall appreciate your completing the attached sheet and returning it to me in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible. We will then send you the instruments for each of your teachers.

Very sincerely yours,

Robert Lynn Canady
Associate Professor of Education

Appendix F

PHI DELTA KAPPA (PDK) SURVEY

Please indicate how many copies of the instrument will be needed by your classroom teachers. Return this information to:

Bureau of Educational Research
School of Education, Ruffner Hall
University of Virginia
405 Emmet Street
Charlottesville, VA 22903

____
Number of classroom teachers to be surveyed

____
Name of Principal

____
School

____
Address

____

____

____
Telephone Number of School

Additional Questions or Comments Relative to the Study:

____

____

____

____

____

Appendix G

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
1819

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
CURRY MEMORIAL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
405 EMMET STREET, RUFFNER HALL

May 16, 1979

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for agreeing to have your teachers participate in the Phi Delta Kappa (University of Virginia Chapter) - Bureau of Educational Research study on classroom teacher role perceptions, alienation, and satisfaction in implementing P.L. 94-142. The information gathered as a result of this study will be used in planning in-service activities in the mainstreaming area in the future.

Enclosed are enough copies of the survey for distribution to your teachers, and a self-addressed envelope. We would prefer that you distribute a questionnaire to each classroom (regular education) teacher; then collect the completed surveys and mail them back (using the enclosed envelope, if you wish) no later than June 8. Since your teachers are part of a sample group of all teachers, their participation is very important.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (804) 924-7341. I thank you again, most sincerely, for your willingness to cooperate.

Sincerely,

Terry Schwartz

Terry Ann Schwartz
Assistant Professor
Research Officer, PDK

TAS:MBR
Enclosures

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA CHARLOTTESVILLE 22903

REFERENCES

Adams, C. F. The relationship of teacher alienation to the organizational structure of schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Buffalo, 1969). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1969, *30*, 1974-A. (University Microfilms No. 69-19015)

Argyris, C. *Integrating the individual and the organization*. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Argyris, C. *Personality and organization*. New York: Harper, 1957.

Barbaconi, D. R., & Clelland, R. W. *Public Law 94-142*: *Special education in transition*. Arlington, Virginia: AASA, 1977.

Besag, F. P. *Alienation and education: An empirical approach*. Buffalo: Hertillon Press, 1966.

Bills, R. E. *A system for assessing affectivity*. University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1975.

Blauner, R. *Alienation and freedom: The factory worker and his industry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Bledsoe, J. C., & Brown, S. E. Factor structure of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1977, *45*(1), 301-302.

Bobbitt, H. R., & Behling, O. Defense mechanism as an alternative explanation of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene results. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1972, *56*(1), 24-27.

Boyd, F. V., Howard, L., & LaBrecque, R. Into the mainstream. *Newsweek*, September 4, 1978, p. 87.

Burnout. In B. Gross, *Teaching under pressure*. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear, 1979. Reprinted from *Soundtracks*, 1976, *2*(2).

Clark, J. P. Measuring alienation within a social system. *American Sociological Review*, 1959, *24*, 849-852.

Corwin, R. G., & Edelfelt, R. A. *Perspectives on organizations: The school as a social organization*. In T. E. Andrews & B. L. Bryant (Eds.). Washington, D. C.: AACTE and ATE, 1977.

Cruickshank, W. M. The false hope of integration. *The Slow Learning Child*, 1974, *21*, 67-68.

Cruickshank, W. M. Least-restrictive placement: Administrative wishful thinking. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 1977, *10*, 193-194.

Cummings, P. W. Does Herzberg's theory really work? *Personnel Administrator*, 1974, *19*(7), 19-23.

Dean, D. G. Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. *American Sociological Review*, 1961, *26*, 753-758.

Diamond, P. R. The constitutional right to education: The quiet revolution. *The Hastings Law Journal*, 1973, *24*, 1087-1127.

Diebold, J. Mainstreaming: A teacher's view. *Children in Contemporary Society--Mainstreaming Part II*, 1978, *11*, 81. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 153-382)

Durkheim, E. [Selected readings of anomie.] (W. C. Bradbury, Jr., Trans.), *University Observer*, 1947, *1*, 51-60. (Reprinted from *Le Suicide, Etude de Sociologie*, 1897, 272-288.)

Edwards, A. L. *Techniques of attitude scale construction*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Ewen, R. B. Some determinants of job satisfaction: A study of the generality of Herzberg's theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1964, *48*(3), 161-163.

Feuer, L. What is alienation? The career of a concept. In M. Stein & A. Vidich (Eds.) *Sociology on trial*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Foster, G., & Keech, U. Teacher reactions to the label of educable mentally retarded. *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded*, 1977, *12*, 307-311.

Getzels, J., Lipham, J., & Campbell, R. *Educational administration as a social process*. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Getzels, J., & Thelan, H. A. The classroom as a unique social system. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), *The dynamics of instructional groups: Fifty-ninth yearbook of the national society for the study of education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Gickling, E. E., Murphy, L. C., & Mallory, D. W. Teachers' preferences for resource services. *Exceptional Children*, 1979, *45*, 442-449.

Gickling, E. E., & Theobald, J. T. Mainstreaming: Affect or effect. *Journal of Special Education*, 1975, *9*, 317-328

Glass, R. M., & Meckler, R. S. Preparing elementary teachers to instruct mildly handicapped children in regular classrooms: A summer workshop. *Exceptional Children*, 1972, *39*, 152-156.

Gottlieb, J., & Gottlieb, B. W. Stereotypic attitudes and behavioral intentions toward handicapped children. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 1977, *82*, 65-71.

Graen, G. B. Testing traditional and two-factor hypotheses concerning job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52(5), 366-371.

Graen, G. B., & Hulin, C. L. Addendum to "An empirical investigation of two implications of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52(4), 341-342.

Grosenick, J. K. Mainstreaming: Current research and evaluation. NN & Q, 1978, 22(6), np.

Gullahorn, J. E., & Gullahorn, J. T. An investigation of the effects of three factors on response to mail questionnaires. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1963, 27, 294-296.

Hall, S. E. The satisfiers and dissatisfiers of Catholic elementary school principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1977.

Harasymiw, S. J., & Horne, M. D. Integration of handicapped children: Its effect on teacher attitudes. Education, 1975, 96, 153-158.

Harasymiw, S. J., & Horne, M. D. Teacher attitudes toward handicapped children and regular class integration. Journal of Special Education, 1976, 10, 393-400.

Helton, G. B., & Oakland, T. D. Teachers' attitudinal responses to differing characteristics of elementary school students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69, 261-265.

Heron, T. E. Maintaining the mainstreamed child in the regular classroom: The decision-making process. Journal of Learning Disability, 1978, 11, 210-215.

Herzberg, F. Work and the nature of man. New York: World Pub. Co., 1966.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Syderman, B. The motivation to work. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Holdaway, E. A. Facet and overall satisfaction of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1978, 14(1), 30-47.

Hoppock, R. Job satisfaction. New York: Harper, 1935.

House, R. J., & Wigdor, L. A. Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism. Personnel Psychology, 1967, 20, 369-389.

Hunter, C. Issues relating to Public Law 94-142. Children In Contemporary Society--Mainstreaming Part I, 1978, 11, 60-61. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 153-381)

James, W. H., & Rotter, J. R. Partial and one hundred percent reinforcement under chance and skill conditions. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1958, 55, 397-403.

Johnson, F. (Ed.). Alienation: Concept, term, and meanings. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley, 1978.

Katzell, R. A. Personal values, job satisfaction, and job behavior. In H. Barow (Ed.), Man in a world at work. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.

Kavanagh, E. A classroom teacher looks at mainstreaming. Elementary School Journal, 1977, 77, 318-322.

Kerlinger, F. Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Keogh, B. K., & Levitt, M. L. Special education in the mainstream: A confrontation of limitations? Focus on Exceptional Children, 1976, 8(1), 1-11.

Lawler, E. E., III. Motivation in work organization. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks Cole, 1973.

Linton, R. The study of man. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1936.

Locke, E. A. What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1969, 4, 309-336.

MacMillan, D. L., Meyers, C. E., & Yoshida, R. K. Regular class teachers' perceptions of transition programs for EMR students and their impact on the students. Psychology in the Schools, 1978, 15, 99-103.

MacMillan, D. L., & Semmel, M. I. Evaluation of mainstreaming programs. Focus on exceptional children, Denver: Love, 1977.

McGregor, D. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Mandell, C. J., & Strain, P. S. An analysis of factors related to the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward mainstreaming mildly handicapped children. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 1978, 3, 154-162.

Mannheim, K. Man and society in an age of reconstruction. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1949.

Manning, R. C. The satisfiers and dissatisfiers of Virginia superintendents of schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1976.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Martin, E. W. Some thoughts on mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 1974, 41, 150-153.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. Burned-out cops and their families. Psychology Today, 1979, 12(12), 58-62.

Maslow, A. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Merton, R. K. Social structure and anomie. American Sociological Review, 1938, 3, 672-682.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire: 1963-1967, 2 editions. Vocational Psychology Research. CAS reported in Tests in Print II, 727-728.

Moeller, G. Bureaucracy and teachers' sense of power. Administrator's Notebook, 1962, 11, 1-4.

Moore, J., & Fine, M. J. Regular and special class teachers' perceptions of normal and exceptional children and their attitudes toward mainstreaming. Psychology in the Schools, 1978, 15, 253-259.

National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped. The individualized education program: Key to an appropriate education for the handicapped child, 1977, annual report. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.

Nettler, G. A measure of alienation. American Sociological Review, 1957 22, 670-677.

Nunnally, J. C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Orpen, C. The limitations of the motivator-hygiene theory of satisfaction: An empirical study with black factory workers in South Africa. Journal of Behavioral Science, 1975, 2(4), 137-149.

Pacheco, A. J. The concept of alienation: From critical theory to social deviance. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1976. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 7925-A. (University Microfilms No. DAH 76-13060)

Park, R. E. Behind our masks. Survey, 1926, 56, 135-139.

Parsons, T. The social system. New York: The Free Press, 1951.

Pearlin, L. I. Alienation from work. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 314-326.

Porter, L. Attitudes in management: Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46, 375.

Proctor, D. I. An investigation of the relationships between knowledge of exceptional children, kind and amount of experience, and attitudes toward their classroom integration (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 28, 1721A. (University Microfilms No. 67-14538)

Rausher, S. R. Mainstreaming: A return to yesteryear? Childhood Education, 1976, 53, 89-93.

Reed, S. Teacher "burnout" a growing hazard. New York Times. January 7, 1979. Educ 12.

Reynolds, M. C. Clinical experiences for mainstreaming: The state of the art. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, February 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 152-733)

Robinson, J. P., Rush, J. G., & Head, K. B. Criteria for an attitude scale. In G. Maranell (Ed.), Scaling--A sourcebook for behavioral scientists. Chicago: Aldine, 1974

Robinson, J. P., & Shaver, P. R. Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Survey Research Center--Institute for Social Research, 1973.

Roeher, G. A. Effective techniques in increasing response to mailed questionnaires. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1963, 27, 299-302.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. Management and the worker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Ronen, S. A. Comparison of job facet satisfaction between paid and unpaid industrial workers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 582-588.

Rotter, J., Seeman, M., & Liverant, S. Internal vs. external control of reinforcements: A major variable in behavior theory. In N. Washburne (Ed.), Decisions, values, and groups (Vol. 2). London: Pergammon Press, 1962.

Rude, C. R. Trends and priorities in in-service training. Exceptional Children, 1978, 44, 172-176.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. An examination of need satisfaction models of job attitudes. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1977, 22(3), 427-456.

Schaffer, R. H. Job satisfaction as related to need satisfaction in work. Psychological Monographs, 1953, 14 (Whole No. 364).

Schmidt, G. T. Job satisfaction among secondary school administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1976, 12(2), 68-86.

The school year has been a total disaster. Exceptional Parent, 1977, 7, 25-27.

Seeman, M. Alienation studies. In A. Inkeles, J. Coleman & N. Smelser (Eds.), Annual review of sociology (Vol. 1). Palo Alto, Calif.: Annual Reviews Inc., 1975.

Seeman, M. On the meaning of alienation. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 783-791.

Sergiovanni, T. J. Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. Journal of Educational Administration, 1967, 2(3), 40.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Carver, F. D. The new school executive. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1973.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. Emerging patterns of supervision: Human perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Severance, L. J., & Gasstrom, L. L. Effects of the label "mentally retarded" on causal explanations for success and failure outcomes. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1977, 81, 547-555.

Smith, P. C. The development of a method of measuring job satisfaction: The Cornell study. In E. A. Fleishman & A. R. Bass (Eds.), Studies in personnel and industrial psychology. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1974.

Smith, P. C., Kendal, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Srole, L. Social integration and certain corollaries: An exploratory study. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 709-716.

Teacher and mainstreaming; I'm ashamed to admit how angry I can feel. Exceptional Parent, 1978, 8(5), 21-24.

Teachers' experiences in Massachusetts. Today's Education, 1976, 65, 23-27.

The teacher's rights in P.L. 94-142--A conversation with attorney Martin Reed. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1978, 11, 331-341.

Trusty, F. M., & Sergiovanni, T. J. Perceived need deficiencies of teachers and administrators: A proposal for restructuring teacher roles. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1966, 2(3), 168-180.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Office of Education. Progress toward a free appropriate public education. HEW publication no. (00) 29-05003, 1979.

Valletutti, P. Integration vs. segregation: A useless dialectic. Journal of Special Education. 1969, 3, 405-408.

Vavrus, M. J. The relationship of teacher alienation to school workplace characteristics and career stages of teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978.

Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Wainwright, H. E. The satisfiers and dissatisfiers of Virginia high school principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1977.

Wanous, J., & Lawler, E. E. III. Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 95-105.

Warwick, D. P., & Lininger, C. A. The sample survey: Theory and practice. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Waters, L. K., & Waters, C. W. Correlates of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction among female clerical workers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53(5), 388-391.

Williams, H. S. The relationship of perceived needs deficiency and organizational structure to alienation among junior high school teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1977.

Yates, J. R. Model for preparing regular teachers for "mainstreaming." Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 471-473.